FIAN/TD-15/96
ITEP/TH-46/96

arXiv:hep-th/9701123v1 23 Jan 1997

More Evidence for the WDVV Equations in N=2 SUSY Yang-Mills Theories

A.Marshakov [1], A.Mironov [2]
Theory Department, P. N. Lebedev Physics Institute, Leninsky prospect 53, Moscow, 117924, Russia
and ITEP, Moscow 117259, Russia
and
A.Morozov [3]
ITEP, Moscow 117 259, Russia

Abstract

We consider $4d$ and $5d$ $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetric theories and demonstrate that in general their Seiberg-Witten prepotentials satisfy the Witten-Dijkgraaf-Verlinde-Verlinde (WDVV) equations. General proof for the Yang-Mills models (with matter in the first fundamental representation) makes use of the hyperelliptic curves and underlying integrable systems. A wide class of examples is discussed, it contains few understandable exceptions. In particular, in perturbative regime of $5d$ theories in addition to naive field theory expectations some extra terms appear, like it happens in heterotic string models. We consider also the example of the Yang-Mills theory with matter hypermultiplet in the adjoint representation (related to the elliptic Calogero-Moser system) when the standard WDVV equations do not hold.

---

[1] E-mail address: mars@lpi.ac.ru, andrei@heron.itep.ru, marshakov@nbivax.nbi.dk

[2] E-mail address: mironov@lpi.ac.ru, mironov@heron.itep.ru

[3] E-mail address: morozov@vxdesy.desy.de

1 Introduction

More than two years ago N.Seiberg and E.Witten proposed a way [1, 2] leading to considerable progress in understanding of the low-energy effective actions. Among other things, it provided a non-trivial confirmation of the old *belief* that the low-energy effective actions (the end-points of the renormalization group flows) fit into universality classes depending on the vacuum structure of the theory. The trivial (and generic) case is that of isolated vacua, i.e. when there are no marginal degrees of freedom and effective theories on the moduli space of the vacua. If degenerated vacua form finite-dimensional varieties, the effective actions can be essentially described in terms of $1d$ systems [1] (representatives of the same universality class), though the original theory lives in a many-dimensional space-time. Moreover, these effective theories can be integrable [2]. Originally, this phenomenon was studied in the context of $2d$ topological theories, while the Seiberg-Witten (SW) construction can be considered as an extension of this approach from two to four space-time ("world sheet") dimensions. The natural context where one encounters continuous degeneration of vacua in four dimensions is *supersymmetry*; the SW construction *per se* concerns the $4d$ $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY Yang-Mills models. Integrable structure behind the SW theory has been found in [3] and later examined in detail in [4]-[11]. Its intimate relation to the previously known topological theories has been revealed recently in [12] where it was proven that the $4d$ prepotentials do satisfy the WDVV equations [13, 14]. The purpose of the present paper is to give more evidence (and more examples) confirming this relation.

Naively, the SW low-energy effective action is not topological: it describes propagating particles. This is, however, a necessary consequence of the vacuum degeneracy and unbroken supersymmetry. All the correlators in the low-energy theory can be expressed through the correlators of "holomorphic" (or "pure topological") subsector. Technically, propagators are contained in the $\langle\phi\bar{\phi}\rangle$ correlators, (derivatives of) which are related by the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetry to the $\langle\phi\phi\rangle$ ones. This is summarized in the statement (sometimes called special geometry) that the low-energy effective action is *completely* expressed in terms of a *holomorphic* prepotential $F(a_I)$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial\bar{a}_I}F = 0$. Even if one accepts the term "topological" for this kind of models, what we consider is a $4d$ topological theory, *a priori* very different from the familiar ($2d$) examples. However, if one believes in the above-mentioned universality, it is clear that only the structure of the moduli space of vacua (but not the space-time dimension) is essential. Since the vacuum variety in the SW theory is finite-dimensional, one should expect that this theory is not too far from the conventional topological models, devised to describe exactly this kind of vacua; as was shown in [12] and confirmed below in the present paper this is indeed the case. The way to see this is to recall that the prepotential of conventional topological theory satisfies the WDVV equations [13, 14] and so does the prepotential of the SW theory [12] (similar claims were made in [15, 16]).

Mathematically, the WDVV equations reflect the specific properties of the moduli space of Riemann spheres with punctures [17, 18], in the $2d$ context these spheres being interpreted as the world sheets. Naturally, in the $4d$ context they could be substituted by the four-dimensional world hypersurfaces, and naively instead of integrable systems, associated with the spectral curves one would deal with those, associated with spectral hypersurfaces – with no reason for the standard WDVV eqs. to emerge. This is of course true for "generic topological $4d$ models", but this is not the only relevant problem that can be addressed in four dimensions. If one instead emphasizes the issue of vacuum structures and universality classes, then the *standard* WDVV eqs should be expected in the (*not* the most degenerate from the $4d$ point of view) situation with finite-dimensional (in the space of all fields) variety of vacua – but the conventional derivation of these equations is not (at least, directly) applicable. Moreover, as argued in [12], the SW example emphasizes that the natural form (and thus the structure behind) the WDVV eqs is covariant under the linear transformations of distinguished (flat) coordinates on the moduli space of vacua – what is true, but not *transparent* in the conventional presentation. For us, all this implies that the true origin of the WDVV eqs is still obscure.

---

[1] By $1d$ $(0 + 1)$ systems here we mean the conventional classical/quantum mechanical systems with *finite*-dimensional phase space (# of degrees of freedom is equal to the rank of the gauge group).

[2] When degenerated vacua form infinite-dimensional structures one should expect generalized integrability (with spectral curve substituted by spectral hypersurface).

Our goal in this paper is rather modest: given (relatively) explicit expressions for particular SW prepotentials we check that they indeed satisfy the WDVV eqs.

In sect.2 we briefly remind what are the WDVV eqs and how they are related in [12] to the algebra of meromorphic 1-differentials on spectral curves.

Then in sect.3 we discuss the perturbative prepotentials in $4d$ and $5d$ $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY Yang-Mills theories which are expected to satisfy the WDVV eqs themselves. We find that this is indeed true, but only when matter hypermultiplets are absent or belong to the first fundamental representation of the gauge group (the representation of the lowest dimension). Remarkably, this is in agreement with the fact that no Seiberg-Witten curves are known beyond such cases, and there are no string model to produce them in the field theory limit.

In sect.4 the WDVV eqs are derived at the non-perturbative level from the representation of the prepotential in terms of spectral Riemann surfaces.

The general reasoning is illustrated in sect.5 by examples which include $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY YM models with classical simple gauge groups and the matter hypermultiplets in the first fundamental representation. Also the $5d$ $SU(N_c)$ pure gauge model is analyzed, and Seiberg-Witten theory is shown to produce a prepotential, corrected as compared to the naive field-theory expectations. Exactly these corrections are necessary to make the WDVV equations true.

Finally, in sect.6 the $SU(N_c)$ model with the matter hypermultiplet in adjoint representation is analyzed in detail. We demonstrate by explicit calculation that the WDVV equations are *not* satisfied in this case. Technically the reason is that the spectral curve is essentially non-hyperelliptic and the algebra of 1-differentials (though existing and being closed) is non-associative. The deep reason for the breakdown of WDVV in its standard from is the appearance of new modulus: the parameter τ of the complex structure on *bare* elliptic curve, which is interpreted as the ultraviolet (UV) coupling constant of the UV-finite $4d$ theory. Further understanding of the relevant deformation of the WDVV equations (presumably related to the analogue of WDVV eqs for the generating function of the elliptic Gromov-Witten classes [19]) is important for further investigation of string models (since τ is the remnant of heterotic dilaton from that point of view).

2 The full set of the WDVV equations

The WDVV equations are non-linear relations for the third derivatives of the prepotential

$$F_{IJK} \equiv \frac{\partial^3 F}{\partial a_I \partial a_J \partial a_K}. \tag{2.1}$$

written in the most convenient way in terms of matrices F_I, $(F_I)_{MN} \equiv F_{IMN}$. The *moduli* a_I are defined up to linear transformations (i.e. define the *flat structure* on the *moduli space*) which leave the whole set (2.4) invariant.

Any linear combination of these matrices can be used to form a "metric"

$$Q = \sum_K q_K F_K. \tag{2.2}$$

Generically it is non-degenerate square matrix and can be used to raise the indices:

$$C_I^{(Q)} \equiv Q^{-1} F_I, \quad \text{or} \quad C^{(Q)}{}^M_{IN} = (Q^{-1})^{ML} F_{ILN}. \tag{2.3}$$

The WDVV equations state that for any given Q all the matrices $C_I^{(Q)}$ commute with each other:

$$C_I^{(Q)} C_J^{(Q)} = C_J^{(Q)} C_I^{(Q)} \qquad \forall I, J \tag{2.4}$$

In particular, if $Q = F_K$, then $C_I^{(K)} = F_K^{-1} F_I$ and [12]

$$F_I F_K^{-1} F_J = F_J F_K^{-1} F_I, \quad \forall I, J, K. \tag{2.5}$$

If (2.5) holds for some index K, say $K = 0$, it is automatically true for any other K (with the only restriction for F_K to be non-degenerate). Indeed, [3] since $F_I = F_0 C_I^{(0)}$,

$$F_I F_K^{-1} F_J = F_0 \left(C_I^{(0)} (C_K^{(0)})^{-1} C_J^{(0)} \right) \tag{2.6}$$

is obviously symmetric w.r.t. the permutation $I \leftrightarrow J$. Of course, it also holds for any other non-degenerate Q in (2.2).

Eqs.(2.4) are just the associativity condition of the formal algebra

$$\begin{gathered} \varphi_I \circ \varphi_J = C^{(Q)}{}^K_{IJ} \varphi_K, \\ (2.4) \Leftrightarrow (\varphi_I \circ \varphi_M) \circ \varphi_J = \varphi_I \circ (\varphi_M \circ \varphi_J). \end{gathered} \tag{2.7}$$

The way to prove the WDVV eqs, used in [12] and in the present paper, is to obtain (2.7) from a family of algebras formed by a certain set of (meromorphic) $(1,0)$-forms on the curves, associated with particular $4d$ Yang-Mills models:

$$dW_I(\zeta) dW_J(\zeta) = C^{(Q)}{}^K_{IJ} dW_K(\zeta) dQ(\zeta) \ \text{mod} \ \left(d\omega(\zeta), d\lambda(\zeta) \right). \tag{2.8}$$

If this algebra exists and is associative we get the WDVV equations in context of the SW approach. The structure constants C_{IJ}^K depend on the choice of the linear combination $dQ(\zeta) = \sum_K q_K dW_K(\zeta)$. In all relevant cases $dW_I(\zeta) \sim P_I(\zeta)$, where for appropriately chosen coordinates $\{\zeta\}$, $P_I(\zeta)$ are polynomials (perhaps, of several variables), thus $dQ(\zeta) \sim \mathcal{Q}'(\zeta) = \sum_K q_K P_K(\zeta)$. Also $d\omega(\zeta) \sim \mathcal{P}'(\zeta)$, $d\lambda(\zeta) \sim \dot{\mathcal{P}}(\zeta)$ with some polynomials $\mathcal{P}'(\zeta)$, $\dot{\mathcal{P}}(\zeta)$ and (2.4) is equivalent to a certain associative algebra of polynomials

---

[3] This simple proof was suggested to us by A.Rosly.

$$P_I P_J = C^{(Q)}{}_{IJ}^{K} P_K \mathcal{Q}' \text{ mod } (\mathcal{P}', \dot{\mathcal{P}}). \tag{2.9}$$

In order to obtain the WDVV equations one still needs to express the structure constants matrices $C_I^{(Q)}$ through F_I (which, in contrast to C_I, are independent of the "metric" Q). In all relevant cases the third derivatives of the prepotential are expressed in terms of the same 1-differentials as in (2.8):

$$F_{IJK} = \operatorname*{res}_{d\omega=0} \frac{dW_I dW_J dW_K}{d\lambda d\omega}, \tag{2.10}$$

where $\delta\lambda \wedge \delta\omega$ is the symplectic form on the phase space of $1d$ integrable system, associated with given $4d$ model.

From (2.2) and (2.10),

$$Q_{LK} \equiv \sum_M q_M F_{LKM} = \operatorname*{res}_{d\omega=0} \frac{dW_L dW_K dQ}{d\lambda d\omega} \tag{2.11}$$

and according to (2.8)

$$F_{IJK} = C^{(Q)}{}_{IJ}^{L} Q_{LK}. \tag{2.12}$$

Given (2.8) and (2.10) this provides the proof of the WDVV eqs.

We derive eq.(2.10) in detail in sect.4 and consider particular examples of the SW theory and associated algebras (2.8) in sect.5. Let us now make several comments.

Conventional derivations of the WDVV equations rely upon the assumption that at least one of the "metrics" Q in (2.4) is flat. Under this assumption one can relate the associativity equation (2.4) to the flatness of the connection

$$\partial_I \delta_B^A + z C_{IB}^A \tag{2.13}$$

with *arbitrary* spectral parameter z, and then to the theory of deformations of Hodge structures and the standard theory of quantum cohomologies. There is no *a priori* reason for any

$$Q_{IJ} = \operatorname*{res}_{d\omega=0} \frac{dW_I dW_J dQ}{d\lambda d\omega}, \tag{2.14}$$

to be flat and in this context such kind of derivation – even if exists – would look somewhat artificial.

In our presentation the WDVV equations depend on a *triple* of differentials on the spectral curve, $d\omega$, $d\lambda$, dQ. The first two, $d\omega$ and $d\lambda$, describe the symplectic structure $\delta\omega \wedge \delta\lambda$ of the relevant integrable system, this is the pair, discussed in [20, 21, 9, 10] and in another context in [22]. The choice of the third differential dQ is more or less arbitrary.[4] Sometime (for example, for hyperelliptic spectral surfaces) the algebra (2.8) depends only on the pair dQ, $d\omega$ (or $\mathcal{Q}'$, $\mathcal{P}'$ in the formulation (2.9)). We shall demonstrate below that just in this case the algebra (2.8) is associative and the WDVV equations are fulfilled. The pair of differentials in this case is essentially the same as arising in many related contexts: (p, q) in minimal conformal models, a pair of polynomials in associated matrix models [24, 25, 22], a pair of operators in the Kac-Schwarz problem [26, 22] and in a bispectral problem in the theory of KP/Toda hierarchies [27] etc. The simplest example of this structure is the family of associative rings in the number theory, with multiplication $ab = qc + pd$ with co-prime q and $p > q$ where a, b, c belong to the field of residues modulo p, while d is defined modulo q. All the algebras with multiplication rule $a \cdot_q b = c$ are isomorphic, but if considered as a *family* over the "moduli space" of q's, they form some new non-trivial structure. In this oversimplified example the "moduli space" is discrete, but it becomes continuous as soon as one switches to the families of the polynomial rings (2.9). One can assume that it is this structure – a *family* of associative algebras (not just a *single* associative algebra) – that stands behind the WDVV equations, and then it should be searched for in the theory of quantum cohomologies, and in topological theories. (Let us emphasize [12] that even if some particular metric Q is flat, this is normally not so for all other Q's.)

---

[4] In the conventional Landau-Ginzburg topological models the spectral curve is Riemann sphere. In this case dQ can be considered as "dressed" $d\lambda$: $dQ(\lambda) = q(\lambda)d\lambda$ with some *polynomial* $q(\lambda)$ and there is a distinguished choice, $q(\lambda) = 1$, i.e. $dQ = d\lambda$ when the associated metric is flat [23, 21].

3 The SW prepotentials. Perturbative examples

3.1 General formulas

If the exact prepotential of the SW theory satisfies the WDVV equations, the same should be true for its perturbative part *per se*, since in $4d$ SUSY YM theory the perturbative contribution to effective action is one-loop, pure logarithmic, and well defined as a *leading* term in $1/a$ expansion. In [12] we discussed this phenomenon for the pure gauge $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY model and in this section we are going to present more general examples.

Perturbatively, the prepotential of the pure gauge $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY YM model with the gauge group $G = SU(N_c)$ is given by

$$F_0 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \le r < r' \le N_c} (a_r - a_{r'})^2 \log(a_r - a_{r'}) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{r,r'} (a_r - a_{r'})^2 \log(a_r - a_{r'}), \qquad \sum_{1 \le r \le N_c} a_r = 0 \tag{3.1}$$

This formula establishes that when v.e.v.'s of the scalar fields in the gauge supermultiplet are non-vanishing (perturbatively a_r are eigenvalues of the vacuum expectation matrix $\langle \phi \rangle$), the fields in the gauge multiplet acquire masses $m_{rr'} = a_r - a_{r'}$ (the pair of indices (r, r') label a field in the adjoint representation of G), and

$$F = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{masses} (mass)^2 \log(mass). \tag{3.2}$$

Now, the formula (3.2) can be easily generalized.

There are two origins of masses in $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY YM models: first, they can be generated by vacuum values of the scalar ϕ from the gauge supermultiplet. For a supermultiplet in representation R of the gauge group G this contribution to the prepotential is given by the analog of the Coleman-Weinberg formula:

$$F_R = \pm \frac{1}{4} \mathrm{Tr}_R \, \phi^2 \log \phi, \tag{3.3}$$

and the sign is "+" for vector supermultiplets (normally they are in the adjoint representation) and "−" for matter hypermultiplets. Second, there are bare masses m_R which should be added to ϕ in (3.3). As a result, the general expression for the perturbative prepotential is

$$\begin{gathered} F = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{vector\ multiplets} \mathrm{Tr}_A (\phi + M_n I_A)^2 \log(\phi + M_n I_A) - \\ -\frac{1}{4} \sum_{hypermultiplets} \mathrm{Tr}_R (\phi + m_R I_R)^2 \log(\phi + m_R I_R) + f(m) \end{gathered} \tag{3.4}$$

where the term $f(M)$ depending only on the masses is not fixed by the (perturbative) field theory but can be read off from the non-perturbative description and I_R denotes the unit matrix in representation R.

Now let us consider some examples. Sometimes, when explicit calculations are tedious, we have used the computer simulations with the MAPLE program to check the perturbative formulas for the groups of low ranks. The proof of these formulas comes from the consideration of sect.5.2. We start with the gauge group $SU(N_c)$ and consider its different representations.

3.2 A_n models

Formula (3.4) can be immediately rewritten in terms of the eigenvalues a_i of $\langle\phi\rangle_F$ in the fundamental representation F. Since the adjoint representation $A \in F \times \bar{F}$, the eigenvalues of the same $\langle\phi\rangle$ in the adjoint representation are equal to $a_r - a_{r'}$. Thus, the contribution of the adjoint hypermultiplet is equal to

$$F_A = \pm\frac{1}{4}\sum_{r,r'}(a_r - a_{r'} + M)^2 \log(a_r - a_{r'} + M), \tag{3.5}$$

in accordance with the original formula (3.1). The contribution of each fundamental hypermultiplet is

$$F_F = -\frac{1}{4}\sum_{r}(a_r + m)^2 \log(a_r + m). \tag{3.6}$$

For the hypermultiplet in the symmetric/antisymmetric square of the fundamental representation

$$\begin{aligned} F_S &= -\frac{1}{4}\sum_{r\le r'}(a_r + a_{r'} + m)^2 \log(a_r + a_{r'} + m), \\ F_{AS} &= -\frac{1}{4}\sum_{r<r'}(a_r + a_{r'} + m)^2 \log(a_r + a_{r'} + m). \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

In further consideration we change the sign of masses to make them more similar to variables a's.

Normally, in $4d$ model there is only one vector multiplet in the adjoint representation of the gauge group. In order to preserve the asymptotic freedom, the set of hypermultiplets should satisfy

$$N_c - \sum_R N_R T_R \ge 0, \tag{3.8}$$

where n_R is the number of hypermultiplets in representation R and $\mathrm{Tr}_R t_a t_b = T_R \delta_{ab}$ (i.e. $T_F = 1/2$, $T_A = N_c$, $T_S = \frac{N_c+2}{2}$, $T_{AS} = \frac{N_c-2}{2}$). Thus, there are six choices for the UV-finite models:

$$\begin{gathered} N_A = 1, \\ N_F = 2N_c, \\ N_S = N_{AS} = 1, \\ N_S = 1, \quad N_F = N_c - 2, \\ N_{AS} = 1, \quad N_F = N_c + 2, \\ N_{AS} = 2, \quad N_F = 4, \end{gathered} \tag{3.9}$$

and four series of models with dynamically generated scale Λ_{QCD},

$$\begin{gathered}N_F = 0, 1, \ldots, 2N_c - 1, \\ N_S = 1, \quad N_F = 0, 1, \ldots, N_c - 3, \\ N_{AS} = 1, \quad N_F = 0, 1, \ldots, N_c + 1, \\ N_{AS} = 2, \quad N_F = 0, 1, 2, 3.\end{gathered} \tag{3.10}$$

In [12] we checked explicitly that (3.1) satisfies the WDVV eqs. Simple computer simulations imply that (3.4) is also consistent with the WDVV eqs, at least, if there is only one vector multiplet, if all hypermultiplets are in the (first) fundamental representation of the gauge group $SU(N_c)$ and if (cf. with (3.2))

$$f_F(m) = \frac{1}{4}\sum_{\iota,\iota'}(m_\iota - m_{\iota'})^2 \log(m_\iota - m_{\iota'}) \tag{3.11}$$

Generally, if one considers the prepotential of the form

$$F_0 + rF_F + Kf_F(m) \tag{3.12}$$

the WDVV equations are satisfied with arbitrary r and $K = r^2/4$. Note that for $r = -2$ one can consider (3.12) as a perturbative expression with the "extended" gauge group $SU(N_c + N_F)$.

As for the other possible representations of $SU(N_c)$, the prepotential satisfies the WDVV equations iff r is adjusted so that the leading term at large a is zero. This is equivalent to the condition of the ultraviolet finiteness (or zero β-function), but without special matching of the multiplet number the coefficient r is non-integer. Say, for N_S hypermultiplets in the symmetric representation $r = T_A/N_S T_S = \frac{2N_c}{N_S(N_c+2)}$.

The WDVV equations, however, are always fulfilled for the symmetric and antisymmetric representations with *zero* masses. We will discuss a little later a general empirical rule that allows one to determine whether the prepotential satisfies the WDVV eqs.

3.3 B_n, C_n, D_n models

Now let us turn to the other groups. The eigenvalues of $\langle\phi\rangle$ in the first fundamental representation of the classical series of the Lie groups are

$$\begin{aligned} B_n\ (SO(2n+1)): &\qquad \{a_1, ..., a_n, 0, -a_1, ..., -a_n\}; \\ C_n\ (Sp(n)): &\qquad \{a_1, ..., a_n, -a_1, ..., -a_n\}; \\ D_n\ (SO(2n)): &\qquad \{a_1, ..., a_n, -a_1, ..., -a_n\}\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

while the eigenvalues in the adjoint representation have the form

$$\begin{aligned} B_n: &\qquad \{\pm a_j; \pm a_j \pm a_k\}; \quad j < k \le n \\ C_n: &\qquad \{\pm 2a_j; \pm a_j \pm a_k\}; \quad j < k \le n \\ D_n: &\qquad \{\pm a_j \pm a_k\}, \quad j < k \le n\end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

Analogous formulas can be written for the exceptional groups too. Then, the WDVV equations in the perturbative regime should be true for the pure gauge theory with any group (including exceptional ones) [5]. The prepotential in the pure gauge theory can be read off from the formula (3.14) and has the form

$$\begin{aligned}
B_n: &\quad F_0=\frac{1}{4}\sum_{i,i}\Big((a_i-a_j)^2\log{(a_i-a_j)}+(a_i+a_j)^2\log{(a_i+a_j)}\Big)+\frac{1}{2}\sum_i a_i^2\log a_i;\\
C_n: &\quad F_0=\frac{1}{4}\sum_{i,i}\Big((a_i-a_j)^2\log{(a_i-a_j)}+(a_i+a_j)^2\log{(a_i+a_j)}\Big)+2\sum_i a_i^2\log a_i;\\
D_n: &\quad F_0=\frac{1}{4}\sum_{i,i}\Big((a_i-a_j)^2\log{(a_i-a_j)}+(a_i+a_j)^2\log{(a_i+a_j)}\Big)
\end{aligned}\tag{3.15}$$

Let us prove that these prepotentials do really satisfy the WDVV equations. The proof is much similar to that presented in paper [12]. We start with the general prepotential of the form

$$F=\frac{1}{4}\sum_{i,i}\Big(\alpha_-\,(a_i-a_j)^2\log{(a_i-a_j)}+\alpha_+\,(a_i+a_j)^2\log{(a_i+a_j)}\Big)+\frac{\eta}{2}\sum_i a_i^2\log a_i \tag{3.16}$$

$\alpha_\pm$ and η being arbitrary constants. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\{(F_i)_{mn}\}=\frac{\delta_{mn}(1-\delta_{mi})(1-\delta_{ni})}{\alpha_{im}}-\frac{\delta_{mi}(1-\delta_{ni})}{\alpha_{in}}-\frac{\delta_{ni}(1-\delta_{mi})}{\alpha_{im}}+\\
+\left(\frac{1}{\alpha_i}+\sum_{l\neq i}\frac{1}{\alpha_{ik}}\right)\delta_{mi}\delta_{ni}
\end{aligned}\tag{3.17}$$

where

$$\alpha_{mk}\equiv\frac{a_m^2-a_k^2}{\alpha_+(a_m-a_k)+\alpha_-(a_m+a_k)},\qquad \alpha_k\equiv\frac{a_k}{\eta} \tag{3.18}$$

The inverse matrix

$$\{(F_k^{-1})_{mn}\}=\alpha_k+\delta_{mn}\alpha_{km}(1-\delta_{mk}), \tag{3.19}$$

Now in order to prove the WDVV equation, it is sufficient to check the symmetricity w.r.t. the indices of the expression $(F_i^{-1}F_jF_k^{-1})_{\alpha\beta}$. From formulas (3.17)-(3.19), one can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
(F_i^{-1}F_jF_k^{-1})_{\alpha\beta}=&\frac{\alpha_i\alpha_k}{\alpha_j}+\delta_{\alpha\beta}(1-\delta_{i\alpha})(1-\delta_{k\alpha})(1-\delta_{j\alpha})\frac{\alpha_{i\alpha}\alpha_{k\beta}}{\alpha_{j\beta}}+\delta_{j\alpha}\delta_{j\beta}(1-\delta_{i\alpha})(1-\delta_{k\beta})\left(\frac{1}{\alpha_j}+\sum_{n\neq j}\frac{1}{\alpha_{jn}}\right)+\\
&+\delta_{j\alpha}(1-\delta_{i\alpha})\alpha_{i\alpha}\left(\frac{\alpha_k}{\alpha_j}-\frac{\alpha_{k\beta}}{\alpha_{j\beta}}(1-\delta_{k\beta})(1-\delta_{j\beta})\right)+\delta_{j\beta}(1-\delta_{k\beta})\alpha_{k\beta}\left(\frac{\alpha_i}{\alpha_j}-\frac{\alpha_{i\alpha}}{\alpha_{j\alpha}}(1-\delta_{i\alpha})(1-\delta_{j\alpha})\right)=\\
&=\frac{\alpha_i\alpha_k}{\alpha_j}+\delta_{\alpha\beta}(1-\delta_{i\alpha}-\delta_{k\alpha}-\delta_{j\alpha})\frac{\alpha_{i\alpha}\alpha_{k\beta}}{\alpha_{j\beta}}+\delta_{j\alpha}\delta_{j\beta}\left(\frac{1}{\alpha_j}+\sum_{n\neq j}\frac{1}{\alpha_{jn}}\right)+\\
&+\delta_{j\alpha}\alpha_{i\alpha}\left(\frac{\alpha_k}{\alpha_j}-\frac{\alpha_{k\beta}}{\alpha_{j\beta}}(1-\delta_{k\beta}-\delta_{j\beta})\right)+\delta_{j\beta}\alpha_{k\beta}\left(\frac{\alpha_i}{\alpha_j}-\frac{\alpha_{i\alpha}}{\alpha_{j\alpha}}(1-\delta_{i\alpha}-\delta_{j\alpha})\right)
\end{aligned}\tag{3.20}$$

where it is used that $i\neq j\neq k$. The first three terms are evidently symmetric with respect to interchanging $\alpha\leftrightarrow\beta$. The symmetricity of the last two terms implies the identity

$$\alpha_{ij}\left(\frac{\alpha_k}{\alpha_j}-\frac{\alpha_{k\beta}}{\alpha_{j\beta}}\right)=\alpha_{kj}\left(\frac{\alpha_i}{\alpha_j}-\frac{\alpha_{i\beta}}{\alpha_{j\beta}}\right) \tag{3.21}$$

---

[5] The rank of the group should be bigger than 2 for the WDVV equations not to be empty, thus for example in the pure gauge G_2-model they are satisfied trivially. We have checked that the WDVV equations hold for the perturbative prepotential of the pure gauge F_4 model. Note that the corresponding non-perturbative SW curve is not obviously hyperelliptic. Thus, our general reasoning in sect.4 is not directly applicable to this case.

This relation is identically satisfied with any η, but *only* at $\alpha_+ = \alpha_-$ or $\alpha_+ = 0$. These values exactly correspond to the prepotentials for the classical groups (3.15) .

Consider now the theory with the gauge group B_n, C_n or D_n and the matter hypermultiplets in the first fundamental representation. Then, one again needs to add to the prepotential some appropriate terms $f_F(M)$ which depend only on masses and can not be determined from perturbative quantum field theory. The correct form of these terms can be obtained from the requirement for the prepotential to satisfy the WDVV equations; the result reads

$$\begin{gathered} F = F_0 + rF_F + \frac{r^2}{16}\sum_{\iota,\iota'}\Big((m_\iota - m_{\iota'})^2\log(m_\iota - m_{\iota'}) + (m_\iota + m_{\iota'})^2\log(m_\iota + m_{\iota'})\Big) + \\ + \frac{r(r+s)}{4}\sum_\iota m_\iota^2 \log m_\iota \end{gathered} \tag{3.22}$$

where $s = 2$ for the B_n and D_n series and to $s = -2$ for the C_n series. This formula can be also obtained from the perturbative limit of the non-perturbative theory, see sect.5.2. Note that, again at the value $r = -2$, the prepotential (3.22) is associated with the group of higher rank. At the same time, at $r = 2$ and $G = C_n$ one can consider $f(m)$ as coming from the vector multiplet of the group D_{N_f} and, inversely, at $r = 2$ and $G = D_n$ $f(m)$ comes from C_{N_f}.

The last $4d$ example, which is also of great importance, is the theory with matter in the adjoint representation. This theory is associated with the Calogero model (which is analyzed non-perturbatively in detail in sect.6). In this case, the mass M of the hypermultiplet is not included into the set of moduli (otherwise the conformal covariance would make the matrices in the WDVV eqs degenerate and non-invertible). Keeping this in mind, one can easily check that the corresponding expression (3.4) does *not* satisfy WDVV eqs. This result can be also confirmed non-perturbatively, and we reveal its origin in the detailed consideration of sect.6.

To formulate an empiric rule, one may say that the WDVV equations are satisfied by perturbative prepotentials which depend only on the sums of the type $(a_i \pm b_j)$, where moduli a_i and b_j are either periods or masses. This is the case for the models that contain either massive matter hypermultiplets in the first fundamental representations (or their dual), or massless matter in the square product of those. Troubles arise in all other situations because of the terms with $a_i \pm b_j \pm c_k \pm \ldots$[6]

This general rule can be understood in terms of the residue formulas, since it reflects the typical structures arising on the sphere with punctures, which corresponds to the perturbative limit of the non-perturbative hyperelliptic curve as explained in sect.5.2. It is also consistent with the D-brane description of the SW theory and implies that the WDVV equations may have some underlying structure behind this. This rule can be also easily interpreted in D-brane terms, since the interaction of branes is caused by strings between them. The pairwise structure $(a_i \pm b_j)$ exactly reflects this fact, a_i and b_j should be identified with the ends of string.

Let us note that the non-pairwise terms in the prepotential drastically destroy the specific structure of matrices (3.17)-(3.19), spoiling the WDVV equations.

---

[6] The inverse statement is wrong – there are some exceptions when the WDVV equations hold despite the presence of such terms – e.g., for the exceptional groups.

3.4 Beyond $4d$

This connection can be extended even further if one enlarges the set of multiplets and adds more vector multiplets (which all *enhance* the asymptotic freedom). A natural way to do this is to consider some compactification of YM theory from higher dimensions: then the Kaluza-Klein mechanism will produce an infinite tower of vector multiplets in the adjoint representation, with masses being all dependent on the finite number of parameters of the compact manifold. In the simplest case of toroidal compactifications, one has:

$$\{M\} = Mn, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \tag{3.23}$$

for compactification from $5d$ onto a circle [11], or

$$\{M\} = M_1 n_1 + M_2 n_2, \quad n_1, n_2 = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \tag{3.24}$$

for compactification from $6d$ onto a torus. In these cases the formula (3.4) would contain infinite sums and require some regularization. As a result, in the $5d$ case, the second derivative of the prepotential behaves like $\log(\sinh \frac{a}{M})$, i.e. the prepotential is of the form $M^2 Li_3\left(\frac{e^a}{M}\right)$, $Li_3\left(e^x\right) \equiv \sum_{k=1} \frac{e^{kx}}{k^3}$, $Li_3''\left(e^x\right) = -\log\left(1 - e^x\right) = -\frac{x}{2} - \log(2\sinh x/2)$, while, in the $6d$ case, the second derivative is rather logarithm of the Jacobi theta-function $\log\left[\theta\left(\frac{a}{M_2}|\frac{M_1}{M_2}\right)\right]$ and the corresponding prepotential can be represented as a sum of three-logarithms. String theory associates new degrees of freedom with wrapping of string (and brane) configurations around the compactified directions and more sophisticated sums of three-logarithms appear in the expression for the prepotential.

Let us look at the $5d$ theory more carefully. From now on, we normalize a_i so that the mass parameter M is equal to 1. One can easily check that the WDVV equations are *not* satisfied by naive three-logarithm prepotential discussed in the literature [11]. However, this situation can be corrected by adding some cubic terms unexpected from the field theory point of view. These terms are equal to $\sum_{i>j>k} a_i a_j a_k$ so that the complete perturbative prepotential satisfying the WDVV eqs is

$$F = \frac{1}{4}\sum_{i,j}\left(\frac{1}{3}a_{ij}^3 - \frac{1}{2}Li_3\left(e^{-2a_{ij}}\right)\right) - \frac{N_c}{4}\sum_{i>j>k} a_i a_j a_k \tag{3.25}$$

where $a_{ij} \equiv a_i - a_j$. The cubic terms in (3.25) could be compared with the U^3-terms in the perturbative part of the prepotential of heterotic string, coming from the requirement of modular invariance [28]. We show in sect.5.2 how these terms can be obtained in the perturbative limit of the SW non-perturbative description of $5d$ theory.

4 Non-perturbative proof of WDVV equations

4.1 SW theory and the general theory of Riemann surfaces

Non-perturbatively, the SW construction implies that for any $4d$ $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY Yang-Mills model one associates a (finite-dimensional) integrable system, its phase space is a family of abelian varieties (Hamiltonian tori) over a moduli space $\mathcal{M}$, parametrized by the angle and action variables respectively. The phase space itself is directly "observable" when the $4d$ model is compactified to $3d$, i.e. defined in the space-time $R^3 \times S^1$ rather than R^4:

then the angle variables of the integrable system are identified with the Wilson loops along the compactified dimension in the $4d$ model [31]. In the non-compactified case the only four-dimensional observables are the periods of the generating 1-form $dS = "pdq"$ along the non-contractable contours on the Hamiltonian tori. The period matrix for the given system consists of the second derivatives of the prepotential while the B-periods of dS are its first derivatives. A-periods of dS define the *flat* structure on moduli space.

In the context of SW theory one actually deals with specific integrable systems associated with Riemann surfaces (complex curves). This can be understood from the point of view of string theory, which relates the emergency of Yang-Mills theories from string compactifications to emergency of Hitchin-like integrable systems from more general systems [29] associated with the Calabi-Yau families. In practice it means that the families of abelian varieties, relevant for the SW theory are in fact the Jacobian tori of complex curves.

In the context of SW theory one starts with a *bare* spectral curve, with a holomorphic 1-form $d\omega$, which is elliptic curve (torus)

$$E(\tau): \quad y^2 = \prod_{a=1}^{3}(x - e_a(\tau)), \quad \sum_{a=1}^{3} e_a(\tau) = 0, \quad d\omega = \frac{dx}{y}, \tag{4.1}$$

when the YM theory is UV finite, or its degeneration $\tau \to i\infty$ – the double-punctured sphere ("annulus"):

$$x \to w \pm \frac{1}{w}, \quad y \to w \mp \frac{1}{w}, \quad d\omega = \frac{dw}{w} \tag{4.2}$$

From the point of view of integrable system, the Lax operator $\mathcal{L}(x, y)$ is defined as a function (1-differential) on the *bare* spectral curve [30], while the *full* spectral curve $\mathcal{C}$ is given by the Lax-eigenvalue equation: $\det(\mathcal{L}(x, y) - \lambda) = 0$. As a result, $\mathcal{C}$ arises as a ramified covering over the *bare* spectral curve:

$$\mathcal{C}: \quad \mathcal{P}(\lambda; x, y) = 0 \tag{4.3}$$

In the case of the gauge group $G = SU(N_c)$, the function $\mathcal{P}$ is a polynomial of degree N_c in λ.

The function $\mathcal{P}$ depends also on parameters (moduli) s_I, parametrizing the moduli space $\mathcal{M}$. From the point of view of integrable system, the Hamiltonians (integrals of motion) are some specific co-ordinates on the moduli space. From the four-dimensional point of view, the co-ordinates s_I include s_i – (the Schur polynomials of) the adjoint-scalar expectation values $h_k = \frac{1}{k}\langle \mathrm{Tr}\phi^k \rangle$ of the vector $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supermultiplet, as well as $s_\iota = m_\iota$ – the masses of the hypermultiplets.

The generating 1-form $dS \cong \lambda d\omega$ is meromorphic on $\mathcal{C}$ (hereafter the equality modulo total derivatives is denoted by "$\cong$"). The prepotential is defined in terms of the cohomological class of dS:

$$\begin{gathered} a_I = \oint_{A_I} dS, \qquad \frac{\partial F}{\partial a_I} = \int_{B_I} dS \\ A_I \circ B_J = \delta_{IJ}. \end{gathered} \tag{4.4}$$

The cycles A_I include the A_i's wrapping around the handles of $\mathcal{C}$ and A_ι's, going around the singularities of dS (for simplicity we assume that they are simple poles, generalization is obvious). The conjugate contours B_I include the cycles B_i and the *non-closed* contours B_ι, ending at the singularities of dS (see sect.5 of [8] for more details). The integrals $\int_{B_\iota} dS$ are actually divergent, but the coefficient of divergent part is equal to residue of dS at particular singularity, i.e. to a_ι. Thus the divergent contribution to the prepotential is quadratic in a_ι, while the prepotential is normally defined *modulo* quadratic combination of its arguments (since only its *third* derivatives appear in the WDVV equations). In particular models $\oint_{A,B} dS$ for some conjugate pairs of contours are identically zero on entire $\mathcal{M}$: such pairs are not included into our set of indices $\{I\}$.

In the context of SW theory with the data $\{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{C}, dS\}$ the number of independent a_I is exactly the same as $\dim_C \mathcal{M}$. This allows us to use the functions $a_I(s)$ as co-ordinates on moduli space $\mathcal{M}$.

The self-consistency of the definition (4.4) of F, i.e. the fact that the matrix $\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial a_I \partial a_J}$ is symmetric is guaranteed by the following reasoning. Let us take the derivative of dS over moduli:

$$\frac{\partial dS}{\partial s_I} \cong \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial s_I} d\omega = -\frac{\partial \mathcal{P}}{\partial s_I} \frac{d\omega}{\mathcal{P}'} \equiv dv_I. \tag{4.5}$$

where prime denotes the λ-derivative (for constant $x, d\omega$ and s_I). Note that we did not include τ into the set of moduli $\{s_I\}$, therefore we can take s_I-derivatives keeping (x, y) (and thus $d\omega$) fixed: the variation of coordinate on bare curve would not change the cohomology classes. The variation of $\mathcal{P}(\lambda; x, y) = 0$

$$\mathcal{P}' d\lambda + \frac{\partial \mathcal{P}}{\partial \omega} d\omega = 0, \tag{4.6}$$

implies that the zeroes of $d\omega$ and $\mathcal{P}'$ on $\mathcal{C}$ coincide (since $d\lambda$ and $d\omega$ are supposed to have non-coinciding zeroes), and, therefore, $\frac{d\omega}{\mathcal{P}'}$ is a *holomorphic* 1-differential on $\mathcal{C}$. If $\partial \mathcal{P}/\partial s_I$ is non-singular, dv_I is also holomorphic[7] – this is the case of dv_i, while dv_ι have poles encircled by contours A_ι. The second derivative

$$\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial a_I \partial a_J} = F_{IJ} \tag{4.7}$$

is essentially the period matrix of the punctured Riemann surface $\mathcal{C}$

$$\sum_J F_{IJ} \oint_{A_J} dv_L = \int_{B_I} dv_L + \int_{\frac{\partial B_I}{\partial s_L}} dS \tag{4.8}$$

The second term at the r.h.s. can be non-vanishing if the contour B_I is not closed. The end-points of such contours (punctures) are included into the set of moduli (this actually implies that a local coordinate is specified in the vicinity of the puncture). The derivative $\frac{\partial B_I}{\partial s_L}$ is actually a point, thus, $\int_{\frac{\partial B_I}{\partial s_L}} dS = \frac{dS}{d\lambda}\left(\lambda = \frac{\partial B_I}{\partial s_L}\right)$. This term also cancels the possible divergency in $\int_{B_I} dv_L$, making F_{IJ} finite.

As any period matrix F_{IJ} is symmetric:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{IJ} (F_{IJ} - F_{JI}) \oint_{A_I} dv_K \oint_{A_J} dv_L = \\ &= \sum_I \left(\oint_{A_I} dv_K \int_{B_I} dv_L - \int_{B_I} dv_K \oint_{A_I} dv_L \right) + \sum_I \left(\oint_{A_I} dv_K \int_{\frac{\partial B_I}{\partial s_L}} - \int_{\frac{\partial B_I}{\partial s_K}} \oint_{A_I} dv_L \right) \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

The first sum at the r.h.s. is equal to

$$\sum_I \left(\oint_{A_I} dv_K \int_{B_I} dv_L - \int_{B_I} dv_K \oint_{A_I} dv_L \right) = \mathrm{res}\,(v_K dv_L) = 0 \tag{4.10}$$

since all the singularities of dv_K are already taken into account by inclusion of A_ι into our set of A-cycles. The second sum is also zero because the only non-vanishing entries are those with $K = L$.

---

[7] Since curves with punctures and the corresponding meromorphic differentials can be obtained by degeneration of smooth curves of higher genera we do not make any distinction between punctured and smooth curves below. We remind that the holomorphic 1-differentials can have at most simple poles at the punctures while quadratic differentials can have certain double poles etc.

In this paper we also need the moduli derivatives of the prepotential. It is easy to get:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{IJ}\frac{\partial F_{IJ}}{\partial s_M}\oint_{A_I}dv_K\oint_{A_J}dv_L &= \sum_I\left(\oint_{A_I}dv_K\int_{B_I}\frac{\partial dv_L}{\partial s_M}-\int_{B_I}dv_K\oint_{A_I}\frac{\partial dv_L}{\partial s_M}\right)+\Sigma_{KLM}= \\ &= \operatorname{res}\left(dv_K\frac{\partial v_L}{\partial s_M}\right)+\Sigma_{KLM}\end{aligned}\tag{4.11}$$

where

$$\Sigma_{KLM}=\sum_I\left(\oint_{A_I}dv_K\frac{\partial}{\partial s_M}\int_{\frac{\partial B_I}{\partial s_L}}dS+\oint_{A_I}dv_K\int_{\frac{\partial B_I}{\partial s_M}}dv_L-\oint_{A_I}\frac{\partial dv_L}{\partial s_M}\int_{\frac{\partial B_I}{\partial s_K}}dS\right)\tag{4.12}$$

is the contribution of the moduli dependence of punctures.

The residue in (4.11) does not need to vanish, since the derivatives w.r.t. the moduli produces new singularities. Indeed, from (4.5) one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}-\frac{\partial dv_L}{\partial s_M} &= \frac{\partial^2\mathcal{P}}{\partial s_L\partial s_M}\frac{d\omega}{\mathcal{P}'}+\left(\frac{\partial\mathcal{P}}{\partial s_L}\right)'\left(-\frac{\partial\mathcal{P}}{\partial s_M}\right)\frac{d\omega}{\mathcal{P}'}-\frac{\partial\mathcal{P}}{\partial s_L}\frac{\partial\mathcal{P}'}{\partial s_M}\frac{d\omega}{(\mathcal{P}')^2}+\frac{\partial\mathcal{P}}{\partial s_L}\frac{\partial\mathcal{P}}{\partial s_M}\frac{\mathcal{P}''d\omega}{(\mathcal{P}')^3}= \\ &= \left[\left(\frac{\partial\mathcal{P}/\partial s_L\partial\mathcal{P}/\partial s_M}{\mathcal{P}'}\right)'+\frac{\partial^2\mathcal{P}}{\partial s_L\partial s_M}\right]\frac{d\omega}{\mathcal{P}'},\end{aligned}\tag{4.13}$$

and this expression has new singularities (second order poles) at the zeroes of $\mathcal{P}'$ (i.e. of $d\omega$). Note, that the contributions from the singularities of $\partial\mathcal{P}/\partial s_L$, if any, are already taken into account in the l.h.s. of (4.11). Picking up the coefficient at the leading singularity, we obtain:

$$\operatorname{res}\left(dv_K\frac{\partial v_L}{\partial s_M}\right)+\Sigma_{KLM}=-\operatorname*{res}_{d\omega=0}\frac{\partial\mathcal{P}}{\partial s_K}\frac{\partial\mathcal{P}}{\partial s_L}\frac{\partial\mathcal{P}}{\partial s_M}\frac{d\omega^2}{(\mathcal{P}')^3d\lambda}=\operatorname*{res}_{d\omega=0}\frac{dv_Kdv_Ldv_M}{d\omega d\lambda}\tag{4.14}$$

The integrals at the l.h.s. of (4.11) serve to convert the differentials dv_I into *canonical* ones dW_I, satisfying $\oint_{A_I}dW_J=\delta_{IJ}$. The same matrix $\oint_{A_I}dv_J$ relates the derivative w.r.t. the moduli s_I and the periods a_I. Putting all together we obtain (see also [21]):

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial F_{IJ}}{\partial s^K} &= \operatorname*{res}_{d\omega=0}\frac{dW_IdW_Jdv_K}{d\omega d\lambda}; \\ \frac{\partial^3F}{\partial a^I\partial a^J\partial a^K}=\frac{\partial F_{IJ}}{\partial a^K} &= \operatorname*{res}_{d\omega=0}\frac{dW_IdW_JdW_K}{d\omega d\lambda}\end{aligned}\tag{4.15}$$

4.2 Algebra of 1-differentials

We consider particular examples of the algebra (2.8) in sect.5. Here we sketch some common features of these examples that seem to be relevant for existence of such algebras and show that they always exist in the hyperelliptic case.

1) The linear space of differentials dW_I in (2.8) (or the space of dv_I in (4.5)) differs a little bit from the set of *all* holomorphic 1-differentials[8] on punctured [9] spectral curve $\mathcal{C}$ for the following reasons. In elliptic (UV-finite) cases, when the bare spectral curve is $E(\tau)$, $d\omega$ is holomorphic on $\mathcal{C}$, but it is not included into the set $\{dW_I\}$, because the algebra of dW_I is defined *modulo* $d\omega$. Up to such possible corrections, the number of linearly independent dW_I's is $g+n$, where g is the genus of $\mathcal{C}$ and $n+1$ – the number of punctures.

---

[8] For the gauge groups B_n, C_n, D_n one should take *all* 1-differentials which are *odd* under the involution $\lambda\rightarrow-\lambda$.

[9] We mean here by "punctured" that the "holomorphic differentials" can have at most *simple* poles at punctures.

2) The products $dW_I dW_J$ are holomorphic quadratic differentials on the punctured curve $\mathcal{C}$. There are $\frac{(g+n)(g+n-1)}{2}$ (or $\frac{(g+n-1)(g+n-2)}{2}$) such products, but at most $3g-3+2n$ of them are linearly independent, since this is the quantity of independent quadratic differentials.

3) We want to obtain an associative algebra of 1-differentials dW_I,

$$dW_I \circ dW_J = \sum_K C_{IJ}^K dW_K \tag{4.16}$$

which is an ordinary algebra of multiplications *modulo* $d\omega$ and $d\lambda$. In addition to these two 1-differentials one should also specify $dQ \equiv \sum_I q_I dW_I$. Then, any quadratic differential can be represented as their "linear combination", namely:

$$dW_I dW_J = \left(\sum_K C_{IJ}^K dW_K\right) dQ + d\widetilde{W}_{IJ}^{\omega} d\omega + d\widetilde{W}_{IJ}^{\lambda} d\lambda \tag{4.17}$$

and existence of such a representation follows already from the estimation of the number of independent adjustment parameters.

For example, if there are no punctures, all dW_I are holomorphic (have no poles) and so does $d\omega$ (which is not included into the set $\{dW_I\}$), while $d\lambda$ has the second order pole in a single point (this is literally the case for the Calogero model, see sect.6), then $d\widetilde{W}_{IJ}^{Q} \equiv \sum_K C_{IJ}^K dW_K$ has $g-1$ adjustment parameters ($g-1$ structure constants C_{IJ}^K with $K = 1, 2, \ldots, g-1$), while $d\widetilde{W}_{IJ}^{\omega}$ and $d\widetilde{W}_{IJ}^{\lambda}$ are holomorphic differentials, the latter one has the second order zero at the puncture, i.e. they form g- and $g-2$-parametric families respectively. Thus, totally we get $(g-1)+g+(g-2)$ adjustment parameters, exactly exhausting the $3g-3$-dimensional set of independent holomorphic quadratic $dW_I dW_J$. Accurate analysis shows that the matching is preserved at punctured surface as well.

4.3 Associativity and the WDVV equations

However, the existence of the closed algebra does not immediately imply its associativity. Indeed, to check associativity one needs to consider the expansion of products of the 3-differentials:

$$dW_I dW_J dW_K = dW_{IJK} dQ^2 + d^2\widetilde{\widetilde{W}}{}^{\omega}_{IJK} d\omega + d^2\widetilde{\widetilde{W}}{}^{\lambda}_{IJK} d\lambda \tag{4.18}$$

where $dW_{IJK}dQ$ is a set of holomorphic 1-differentials not containing $d\omega$. Now repeating the above counting, we get that there exist totally $(g-1)+(2g-1)+(3g-5)$, since $d^2\widetilde{\widetilde{W}}{}^{\omega}_{IJK}$ are holomorphic quadratic differentials that do not contain $d\lambda$, and $d^2\widetilde{\widetilde{W}}{}^{\lambda}_{IJK}$ are holomorphic quadratic differentials with second order zeroes. Thus, for the $5g-5$ independent holomorphic 3-differentials we have too many, namely, $6g-7$ parameters. Therefore, among the differentials $dW_{IJK}dQ$, $d^2\widetilde{\widetilde{W}}{}^{\lambda}_{IJK}$ and $d^2\widetilde{\widetilde{W}}{}^{\lambda}_{IJK}$ there are some relations that generally spoil associativity. We present in sect.6 the explicit example where associativity is indeed violated.

The situation simplifies different in the hyperelliptic case when there is the additional $\mathbf{Z}_2$-transformation $\sigma : y \to -y$. In this case, the holomorphic differentials, $\frac{P_k(\lambda)d\lambda}{Y}$, $k = 0, \ldots g-1$ (P_k denotes a polynomial of degree k) are *odd* under σ and their quadratic combinations, $\frac{P_k(\lambda)(d\lambda)^2}{Y^2}$, $k = 0, \ldots, 2g-2$ are *even*. The remaining $g-2$ quadratic holomorphic differentials, $\frac{P_k(\lambda)(d\lambda)^2}{Y}$, $k = 0, \ldots, g-3$ are σ-odd and do not appear in the l.h.s. of (4.17). On the other hand, in the expansion (4.17), one can throw away the term with $d\lambda$ at the r.h.s., since $d\lambda$ is σ-even and, therefore, the coefficient in front of it is not a linear combination of the holomorphic differentials dW_I. This restores the correct counting of $2g-1$ adjusting parameters for $2g-1$ differentials. It turns out that this restricted algebra spanned by the two differentials dQ and $d\omega$ is both closed and *associative.* Indeed, if the term with $d\lambda$ is omitted at the r.h.s. of (4.18), there remain $3g-2$ adjusting parameters – exactly as many as there are holomorphic σ-odd 3-differentials $\frac{P_k(\lambda)d\lambda}{y^3}$, $k = 0, \ldots, 3g-3$ that can arise at the l.h.s. in the triple products of dW_I. In other words the algebra in hyperelliptic case is obviously associative since it is isomorphic to the ring of polynomials $\{P_k(\lambda)\}$ – multiplication of all polynomials (of one variable) modulo some ideal.

The same counting can be easily repeated for the general surface with n punctures[10] and leads to the conclusion that the closed associative algebra does always exist for the hyperelliptic case.

According to sect.2 the WDVV eqs are immediately implied by the residue formula (4.15) and associativity of the algebra (4.17) because the terms with $d\omega$ at the r.h.s. of (4.17) do not contribute into (4.15).

5 Examples

5.1 Hyperelliptic curves in the Seiberg-Witten theory

This section contains a series of examples of the algebras of 1-differentials and WDVV equations, arising in particular $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetric models in four and five dimensions. According to [3] and [4], models without matter (pure gauge theories) can be described in terms of integrable systems of the periodic Toda-chain family. The corresponding spectral curves are hyperelliptic, at least, for the classical simple groups G. The function $\mathcal{P}(\lambda, w)$ is nothing but the characteristic polynomial of the dual affine algebra $\hat{G}^\vee$ and looks like (parameter s was introduced in (3.22))

$$\mathcal{P}(\lambda, w) = 2P(\lambda) - w - \frac{Q_0(\lambda)}{w}, \quad d\omega = \frac{dw}{w}, \quad Q_0(\lambda) = \lambda^{2s} \tag{5.1}$$

while

$$dS = \lambda \frac{dw}{w} \tag{5.2}$$

Here $P(\lambda)$ is characteristic polynomial of the algebra G itself, i.e.

$$P(\lambda) = \det(G - \lambda I) = \prod_i (\lambda - \lambda_i) \tag{5.3}$$

where determinant is taken in the first fundamental representation and λ_i's are the eigenvalues of the algebraic element G. For classical simple algebras we have:

$$\begin{gathered} A_n: \quad P(\lambda) = \prod_{i=1}^{N_c} (\lambda - \lambda_i), \quad N_c = n+1, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{N_c} \lambda_i = 0; \quad s = 0; \\ B_n: \quad P(\lambda) = \lambda \prod_{i=1}^{n} (\lambda^2 - \lambda_i^2); \quad s = 2 \\ C_n: \quad P(\lambda) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} (\lambda^2 - \lambda_i^2); \quad s = -2 \\ D_n: \quad P(\lambda) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} (\lambda^2 - \lambda_i^2); \quad s = 2 \end{gathered} \tag{5.4}$$

---

[10] The simplest way to do this is to obtain all the punctures degenerating handles of the Riemann surface of higher genus.

For exceptional groups, the curves arising as the characteristic polynomial of the dual affine algebras do not acquire the hyperelliptic form – and they are left beyond the scope of this paper (though they can still have enough symmetries to suit into the general theory of s.4).

The list (5.4) implies that one needs to analyze separately the cases of A_n and the other three series.

Above formulas are well adjusted for generalizations. In particular, in order to include massive hypermultiplets in the first fundamental representation one can just change $Q_0(\lambda)$ for $Q(\lambda) = Q_0(\lambda)\prod_{\iota=1}^{N_f}(\lambda - m_\iota)$ if $G = A_n$ [32] and $Q(\lambda) = Q_0(\lambda)\prod_{\iota=1}^{N_f}(\lambda^2 - m_\iota^2)$ if $G = B_n, C_n, D_n$ [33] (sometimes it can also make sense to shift $P(\lambda)$ by an m-dependent polynomial $R(\lambda)$, which does not depend on λ_i).

These cases of the matter hypermultiplets included can be described by the periodic XXX-chain family [5].

Working with these models it is sometimes convenient to change the w-variable, $w \rightarrow \sqrt{Q(\lambda)}w$ so that the curve $\mathcal{P}(\lambda, w) = 0$ turns into

$$w + \frac{1}{w} = 2\frac{P(\lambda) + R(\lambda)}{\sqrt{Q(\lambda)}} \tag{5.5}$$

Another possible generalization is the extension to $5d$ models [11]. Then it is enough to change only the formula (5.2),

$$dS^{(5)} = \log\lambda\ \frac{dw}{w} \tag{5.6}$$

and put $Q_0 = \lambda^{N_c/2}$ while eq.(5.1) remains intact. From the point of view of integrable systems this corresponds to changing the Toda chain for the relativistic Toda chain.

Examples that do not suit into this scheme are related to the UV-finite models, of which the simplest one is the $SU(N_c)$ gauge theory in $4d$ with massive hypermultiplet in the adjoint representation. The corresponding integrable system is the elliptic Calogero model, and our analysis in s.6 reveals that it does not satisfy WDVV equations: the closed algebra of holomorphic differentials still exists, but is not associative – in accordance with the general reasoning in s.4.

To conclude these short remarks, let us note that, as we shall see below, associativity of algebras of the holomorphic 1-differentials on hyperelliptic curve reduces afterwards to associativity of the polynomial algebras. Therefore, we consider here the reference pattern of such an algebra. Namely, we look at the algebra of N one-variable polynomials $p_i(\lambda)$ of degree $N-1$ whose product defined by modulo of a polynomial P' of degree N. More concretely, the algebra is defined as

$$p_i(\lambda)p_j(\lambda) = C_{ij}^k p_k(\lambda)W(\lambda) + \xi_{ij}(\lambda)P'(\lambda) \tag{5.7}$$

where $W(\lambda)$ is some fixed linear combination of $p_i(\lambda)$: $W(\lambda) \equiv \sum q_l p_l(\lambda)$ co-prime with $P'(\lambda)$. Then, the l.h.s. of this relation is a polynomial of degree $2(N-1)$ with $2N-1$ coefficients which are to be adjusted by the free parameters in the r.h.s. Since ξ_{ij} is of degree $N-2$, there are exactly $N + (N-1) = 2N-1$ free parameters. The same counting is correct for the triple products of the polynomials and the algebra is associative, since the condition $P'(\lambda) = 0$ leads to the factor-algebra over the ideal $P'(\lambda)$. The same argument does not work for the algebra of holomorphic 1-differentials, since their product belongs to a different space (of quadratic differentials) – see [34].

5.2 Perturbative limit of the pure gauge theories

Now we discuss the simplest case of curves corresponding to the perturbative formulas of sect.3. Perturbative limit of the curve (5.5) is

$$w = 2\frac{P(\lambda)}{\sqrt{Q(\lambda)}} \tag{5.8}$$

and the corresponding

$$\begin{gathered} dS^{(4)} = \lambda d\log\left(\frac{P(\lambda)}{\sqrt{Q(\lambda)}}\right); \\ dS^{(5)} = \log\lambda\ d\log\left(\frac{P(\lambda)}{\sqrt{Q(\lambda)}}\right) \end{gathered} \tag{5.9}$$

We consider first the simplest case of the pure gauge $SU(N_c)$ Yang-Mills theory, i.e. $Q(\lambda) = Q_0(\lambda) = 1$. The both cases of $4d$ and $5d$ theories can be treated simultaneously. Indeed, they are described by the same Riemann surface (5.8) which is nothing but the sphere with punctures[11], the only difference being the restrictions imposed onto the set of moduli $\{\lambda_i\}$'s – in the $4d$ case they are constrained to satisfy the condition $\sum_i^{N_c}\lambda_i = 0$, while in the $5d$ one – $\prod_i^{N_c}\lambda_i = 1$. Now the set of the $N_c - 1$ independent canonical holomorphic differentials is[12]

$$d\omega_i = \left(\frac{1}{\lambda-\lambda_i} - \frac{1}{\lambda-\lambda_{N_c}}\right)d\lambda = \frac{\lambda_{iN_c}d\lambda}{(\lambda-\lambda_i)(\lambda-\lambda_{N_c})}, \quad i = 1,...,N_c, \quad \lambda_{ij}\equiv\lambda_i-\lambda_j \tag{5.10}$$

and one can easily check that $\lambda_i = a_i$ (a-periods) in the $4d$ case and $\lambda_i = e^{a_i}$ in the $5d$ case, i.e. $\sum_i a_i = 0$.

The next step is to expand the product of two such differentials

$$d\omega_i d\omega_j = \left(C_{ij}^k d\omega_k\right)\left(q_l d\omega_l\right) + \left(D_{ij}^k d\omega_k\right)d\log P(\lambda), \quad d\log P(\lambda) = \sum_l^{N_c}\frac{d\lambda}{\lambda-\lambda_l} \tag{5.11}$$

Converting this expression to the normal form with common denominator $P(\lambda)$, one reproduces (5.7) for polynomial algebra. Therefore, the structure constants C_{ij}^k form the closed associative algebra and, in accordance with our general formulas, can be expressed through the prepotential by residue formulas

$$\begin{gathered} F_{ijk} = \operatorname*{res}_{d\log P=0}\frac{d\omega_i d\omega_j d\omega_k}{d\log P(\lambda)d\lambda} \quad \text{for the } 4d \text{ case,} \\ F_{ijk} = \operatorname*{res}_{d\log P=0}\frac{d\omega_i d\omega_j d\omega_k}{d\log P(\lambda)\frac{d\lambda}{\lambda}} \quad \text{for the } 5d \text{ case} \end{gathered} \tag{5.12}$$

These residues can be easily calculated. The only technical trick is to calculate the residues not at zeroes of $d\log P$ but at poles of $d\omega$'s. This can be done immediately since there are no contributions from the infinity

---

[11] These punctures emerge as a degeneration of the handles of the hyperelliptic surface so that the a-cycles encircle the punctures.

[12] It can be instructive to describe in more details why (5.10) arises not only in $4d$, but also in $5d$ models. Strictly speaking, in the $5d$ case, one should consider differentials on annulus, not on sphere. Therefore, instead of $\frac{d\lambda}{\lambda-\lambda_i}$, one rather needs to take $\sum_{m=-\infty}^{+\infty}\frac{da}{a-a_i+2n} \sim \coth\frac{a-a_i}{2}\frac{da}{2} = \frac{\lambda+\lambda_i}{\lambda-\lambda_i}\frac{d\lambda}{2\lambda}$, where $\lambda \equiv e^a$. Considering now, instead of $d\omega_i = \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda-\lambda_i} - \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda-\lambda_{N_c}} = \frac{\lambda_{iN_c}d\lambda}{(\lambda-\lambda_i)(\lambda-\lambda_{N_c}}$, differentials $d\omega_i = \frac{\lambda+\lambda_i}{\lambda-\lambda_i}\frac{d\lambda}{2\lambda} - \frac{\lambda+\lambda_{N_c}}{\lambda-\lambda_{N_c}}\frac{d\lambda}{2\lambda} = \frac{\lambda_{iN_c}d\lambda}{(\lambda-\lambda_i)(\lambda-\lambda_{N_c})}$, we obtain exactly formula (5.10).

$\lambda = \infty$. The final results have the following form

for the $4d$ case :

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{iii} &= \sum_{k\neq i}\frac{1}{a_{ik}} + \frac{6}{a_{iN_c}} + \sum_{k\neq N_c}\frac{1}{a_{kN_c}},\\
F_{iij} &= \frac{3}{a_{iN_c}} + \frac{2}{a_{jN_c}} + \sum_{k\neq i,j,N_c}\frac{1}{a_{kN_c}} - \frac{a_{jN_c}}{a_{iN_c}a_{ij}}, \quad i\neq j,\\
F_{ijk} &= 2\sum_{l\neq N_c}\frac{1}{a_{lN_c}} - \sum_{l\neq i,j,k,N_c}\frac{1}{a_{lN_c}}, \quad i\neq j\neq k;
\end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

for the $5d$ case :

$$\begin{aligned}
2F_{iii} &= \sum_{k\neq i}\coth a_{ik} + 6\coth a_{iN_c} + \sum_{k\neq N_c}\coth a_{kN_c},\\
2F_{iij} &= -\coth a_{ij} + 4\coth a_{iN_c} + 2\coth a_{jN_c} + \sum_{k\neq i,j,N_c}\coth a_{kN_c} + N_c, \quad i\neq j,\\
2F_{ijk} &= 2\sum_{l\neq N_c}\coth a_{lN_c} - \sum_{l\neq i,j,k,N_c}\coth a_{lN_c} + N_c, \quad i\neq j\neq k
\end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

Now it is immediate to check that the prepotential in the $4d$ case really is given by the formula (3.5), while in the $5d$ case – by (3.25). These results are in perfect agreement with the results of s.3.

Now let us turn to the case of massive hypermultiplets included and, for the sake of simplicity, restrict ourselves to the $4d$ case. Then, there arise additional differentials corresponding to the derivatives of dS (5.9) with respect to masses. They are of the form

$$dW_\iota = -\frac{1}{2}\frac{d\lambda}{\lambda-\lambda_\iota} \tag{5.15}$$

Again, full set of the differentials gives rise to the closed associative algebra. As earlier, this can be proved by reducing the system of differentials to the polynomial one (this time the common denominator should be $P(\lambda)Q(\lambda)$). Then, applying the residue formula, one reproduces formula (3.12) for the perturbative prepotential with $r=1$. In order to obtain (3.12) with arbitrary coefficient r, one needs to consider instead of $\sqrt{Q(\lambda)}$ in (5.8)-(5.9) $Q(\lambda)^{r/2}$. This only changes normalization of the differentials (5.15): $dW_\iota = -\frac{r}{2}\frac{d\lambda}{\lambda-\lambda_\iota}$. Now it is straightforward to use the residue formula[13]

$$F_{IJK} = \mathop{\mathrm{res}}_{d\log\frac{P}{\sqrt{Q}}=0}\frac{dW_I dW_J dW_K}{d\log\frac{P(\lambda)}{\sqrt{Q(\lambda)}}d\lambda}, \qquad \{I,J,K,\dots\} = \{i,j,k,\dots|\iota,\iota',\iota'',\dots\} \tag{5.16}$$

---

[13] Let us note that, despite the differentials dW_ι have the pole at infinity, this does not contribute into the residue formula because of the quadratic pole of $d\lambda$ in the denominator.

and obtain

$$\begin{gathered}
F_{iii} = \sum_{k\neq i}\frac{1}{\lambda_{ik}} + \frac{6}{\lambda_{iN_c}} + \sum_{k\neq N_c}\frac{1}{\lambda_{kN_c}} - \frac{r}{2}\sum_{\iota}\frac{\lambda_{iN_c}}{\lambda_{i\iota}\lambda_{\iota N_c}}, \\
F_{iij} = \frac{3}{\lambda_{iN_c}} + \frac{2}{\lambda_{jN_c}} + \sum_{k\neq i,j,N_c}\frac{1}{\lambda_{kN_c}} - \frac{\lambda_{jN_c}}{\lambda_{iN_c}\lambda_{ij}} - \frac{r}{2}\sum_{\iota}\frac{1}{\lambda_{\iota N_c}}, \quad i\neq j, \\
F_{ijk} = 2\sum_{l\neq N_c}\frac{1}{\lambda_{lN_c}} - \sum_{l\neq i,j,k,N_c}\frac{1}{\lambda_{lN_c}} - \frac{r}{2}\sum_{\iota}\frac{1}{\lambda_{\iota N_c}}, \quad i\neq j\neq k; \\
F_{ii\iota} = \frac{r}{2}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_{i\iota}} - \frac{1}{\lambda_{\iota N_c}}\right); \\
F_{ij\iota} = -\frac{r}{2}\frac{1}{\lambda_{\iota N_c}}, \quad i\neq j; \\
F_{i\iota\iota} = -\frac{r}{2}\frac{\lambda_{iN_c}}{\lambda_{i\iota}\lambda_{\iota N_c}}; \\
F_{\iota\iota\iota} = \frac{r}{2}\sum_{i}\frac{1}{\lambda_{\iota i}} + \frac{r^2}{4}\sum_{\iota'}\frac{1}{\lambda_{\iota\iota'}}; \\
F_{\iota\iota\iota'} = -\frac{r^2}{4}\frac{1}{\lambda_{\iota\iota'}}, \quad \iota\neq\iota'; \\
F_{i\iota\iota'} = F_{\iota\iota'\iota''} = 0
\end{gathered} \tag{5.17}$$

These formulas immediately lead to the prepotential (3.12) upon the identification $\lambda_i = a_i$ and $\lambda_\iota = m_\iota$.

At last, let us consider the case of other classical groups. We also take into account the massive hypermultiplets. Let us also note that, in this case, the curve is invariant w.r.t. the involution $\rho : \lambda \to -\lambda$. Among all the holomorphic differentials there is a subset of the ρ-odd ones that can be obtained by differentiating the ρ-odd generating differential $dS \cong \lambda\left(\sum_i \frac{2\lambda d\lambda}{\lambda^2-a_i^2} - r\sum_\iota \frac{\lambda d\lambda}{\lambda^2-m_\iota^2} - s\frac{d\lambda}{\lambda}\right)$ w.r.t. the moduli:

$$dW_i = \frac{2a_i d\lambda}{\lambda^2 - a_i^2}, \qquad dW_\iota = -\frac{rm_\iota d\lambda}{\lambda^2 - m_\iota^2} \tag{5.18}$$

Look at the algebra of these differentials:

$$\frac{d\lambda}{\lambda^2-\lambda_I^2}\frac{d\lambda}{\lambda^2-\lambda_J^2} \sim C_{IJ}^K\frac{d\lambda}{\lambda^2-\lambda_K^2}dW + \xi_{IJ}(\lambda)\left(\sum_i\frac{2\lambda d\lambda}{\lambda^2-a_i^2} - r\sum_\iota\frac{\lambda d\lambda}{\lambda^2-m_\iota^2} - s\frac{d\lambda}{\lambda}\right) \tag{5.19}$$

To understand that this algebra is closed and associative, it is sufficient to note that the l.h.s. of (5.19) is a linear combination of the differentials $\frac{(d\lambda)^2}{\lambda^2-\lambda_I^2}$ and $\frac{(d\lambda)^2}{(\lambda^2-\lambda_I^2)^2}$ – totally $2N \equiv 2n + 2N_f$ independent quadratic ρ-even differentials. However, one should also take into account the condition which cancels the pole at infinity of $\frac{(d\lambda)^2}{\lambda^2-\lambda_I^2}$. Thus, the number of *holomorphic* ρ-even quadratic differentials is equal to $2N-1$. This quantity perfectly suits the $2N-1$ adjusting parameters in the r.h.s. of (5.19) – N ρ-odd differentials in the first term and $N-1$ ρ-even differentials in the second term. Indeed, even differentials are $\frac{\lambda d\lambda}{\lambda^2-\lambda_I^2}$, i.e. have the pole at infinity. The same does the $\frac{dw}{w} = \left(\sum_i \frac{2\lambda d\lambda}{\lambda^2-a_i^2} - \sum_\iota \frac{r\lambda d\lambda}{\lambda^2-m_\iota^2} - s\frac{d\lambda}{\lambda}\right)$. However, since all these quantities can be rewritten as depending on λ^2, the cancellation of the pole of the differentials leads to their large-λ behaviour $\frac{d\lambda}{\lambda^3}$ that simultaneously cancels the pole of $\frac{dw}{w}$. Thus, there is exactly one condition imposed onto N *rho*-even differentials.

The associativity is checked in complete analogy with the above consideration – there are $3N-3$ holomorphic ρ-odd cubic differentials and exactly $N + (2N-3) = 3N-3$ adjusting parameters. Thus, the algebra (5.19) is really closed associative[14]. The application of the residue formula (5.16) gives now (3.22).

Now we turn to the less trivial examples corresponding to full hyperelliptic curves.

5.3 Pure gauge model (Toda chain system)

This example was analyzed in detail in ref.[12].

The spectral curve has the form

$$\mathcal{P}(\lambda, w) = 2P(\lambda) - w - \frac{1}{w}, \quad P(\lambda) \equiv \sum_{k=0}^{N_c} s_k \lambda^k \tag{5.20}$$

and can be represented in the standard hyperelliptic form after the change of variables $Y = \frac{1}{2}\left(w - \frac{1}{w}\right)$

$$Y^2 = P^2(\lambda) - 1 \tag{5.21}$$

and is of genus $g = N_c - 1$ [15]. Note that $s_{N_c} = 1$ and that the condition of the unit determinant of the matrix in the group $SU(N_c)$ implies here that $s_{N_c - 1} = 0$ (this is equivalent to the condition $\sum a_i = 0$). The generating differential dS has the form

$$dS = \lambda \frac{dw}{w} = \lambda \frac{dP}{Y} \tag{5.22}$$

Now let us discuss associativity of the algebra of holomorphic differentials

$$d\omega_i(\lambda) d\omega_j(\lambda) = C_{ij}^k d\omega_k(\lambda) dW(\lambda) \text{ mod } \frac{dw}{w} \tag{5.23}$$

We require that $dW(\lambda)$ and $dP(\lambda)$ are co-prime.

If the algebra (5.23) exists, the structure constants C_{ij}^k satisfy the associativity condition. But we still need to show that it indeed exists, i.e. that once dW is given, one can find (λ-independent) C_{ij}^k. This is a simple exercise: all $d\omega_i$ are linear combinations of

$$dv_k(\lambda) = \frac{\lambda^k d\lambda}{Y} \cong \frac{\partial dS}{\partial s_k}, \quad k = 0, \ldots, g-1 \tag{5.24}$$

where

$$dv_k(\lambda) = \sigma_{ki} d\omega_i(\lambda), \quad d\omega_i = (\sigma^{-1})_{ik} dv_k, \quad \sigma_{ki} = \oint_{A_i} dv_k, \tag{5.25}$$

also $dW(\lambda) = q_k dv_k(\lambda)$. Thus, (5.23), after multiplying all 1-differentials by Y, reduces to the algebra of polynomials $\left(\sigma_{ii'}^{-1} \lambda^{i'-1}\right)$ that is as usual closed and associative. This means that C_{ij}^k satisfy the associativity condition

$$C_i C_j = C_j C_i \tag{5.26}$$

Now the residue formula has the form [12]:

$$\begin{gathered} F_{ijk} = \frac{\partial^3 F}{\partial a_i \partial a_j \partial a_k} = \frac{\partial F_{ij}}{\partial a_k} = \\ = \operatorname*{res}_{d\lambda=0} \frac{d\omega_i d\omega_j d\omega_k}{d\lambda \left(\frac{dw}{w}\right)} = \operatorname*{res}_{d\lambda=0} \frac{d\omega_i d\omega_j d\omega_k}{d\lambda \frac{dP}{Y}} = \sum_\alpha \frac{\hat{\omega}_i(\lambda_\alpha) \hat{\omega}_j(\lambda_\alpha) \hat{\omega}_k(\lambda_\alpha)}{P'(\lambda_\alpha)/\hat{Y}(\lambda_\alpha)} \end{gathered} \tag{5.27}$$

---

[14] In sect.5.5 we show how this algebra reduces to the polynomial one.

[15] One can take for the g moduli the set $\{h_k\}$ or instead the set of periods $\{a_i\}$. This particular family is associated with the Toda-chain hierarchy, N_c being the length of the chain.

The sum at the r.h.s. goes over all the $2g+2$ ramification points λ_α of the hyperelliptic curve (i.e. over the zeroes of $Y^2 = P^2(\lambda) - 1 = \prod_{\alpha=1}^{N}(\lambda - \lambda_\alpha)$); $d\omega_i(\lambda) = (\hat\omega_i(\lambda_\alpha) + O(\lambda-\lambda_\alpha))d\lambda$, $\hat Y^2(\lambda_\alpha) = \prod_{\beta\neq\alpha}(\lambda_\alpha - \lambda_\beta)$.

Now following the line of sect.2, we can define the metric:

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_{kl}(dW) = \operatorname*{res}_{d\lambda=0}\frac{d\omega_k d\omega_l dW}{d\lambda\left(\frac{dw}{w}\right)} = \operatorname*{res}_{d\lambda=0}\frac{d\omega_k d\omega_l dW}{d\lambda\frac{dP}{Y}} = \\ = \sum_\alpha \frac{\hat\omega_k(\lambda_\alpha)\hat\omega_l(\lambda_\alpha)\hat W(\lambda_\alpha)}{P'(\lambda_\alpha)/\hat Y(\lambda_\alpha)}\end{aligned} \tag{5.28}$$

In particular, for $dW = d\omega_k$ (which is evidently co-prime with $\frac{dP}{Y}$), $\eta_{ij}(d\omega_k) = F_{ijk}$ – this choice immediately give rise to the WDVV in the form (5) of paper [12].

Given (5.23), (5.27) and (5.28), one can check that

$$F_{ijk} = \eta_{kl}(dW)C^k_{ij}(dW). \tag{5.29}$$

Note that $F_{ijk} = \frac{\partial^3 F}{\partial a_i \partial a_j \partial a_k}$ at the l.h.s. of (5.29) is independent of dW! The r.h.s. of (5.29) is equal to:

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_{kl}(dW)C^l_{ij}(dW) = \operatorname*{res}_{d\lambda=0}\frac{d\omega_k d\omega_l dW}{d\lambda\left(\frac{dw}{w}\right)}C^l_{ij}(dW) \overset{(5.23)}{=} \\ = \operatorname*{res}_{d\lambda=0}\frac{d\omega_k}{d\lambda\left(\frac{dw}{w}\right)}\left(d\omega_i d\omega_j - p_{ij}\frac{dPd\lambda}{Y^2}\right) = F_{ijk} - \operatorname*{res}_{d\lambda=0}\frac{d\omega_k}{d\lambda\left(\frac{dP}{Y}\right)}p_{ij}(\lambda)\frac{dPd\lambda}{Y^2} = \\ = F_{ijk} - \operatorname*{res}_{d\lambda=0}\frac{p_{ij}(\lambda)d\omega_k(\lambda)}{Y}\end{aligned} \tag{5.30}$$

It remains to prove that the last item is indeed vanishing for any i,j,k. This follows from the fact that $\frac{p_{ij}(\lambda)d\omega_k(\lambda)}{Y}$ is singular only at zeroes of Y, it is not singular at $\lambda = \infty$ because $p_{ij}(\lambda)$ is a polynomial of low enough degree $g-2 < g+1$. Thus the sum of its residues at ramification points is thus the sum over *all* the residues and therefore vanishes.

This completes the proof of associativity condition for any dW.

5.4 $5d$ pure gauge theory (Relativistic Toda chain)

The above proof can be almost literally transferred to the case of the relativistic Toda chain system corresponding to the $5d$ $N=2$ SUSY pure gauge model with one compactified dimension [11]. The main reason is that in the case of relativistic Toda chain the spectral curve is a minor modification of (5.20) having the form [11, eq.(2.23)]

$$w + \frac{1}{w} = (\zeta\lambda)^{-N_c/2}P(\lambda), \tag{5.31}$$

which can be again rewritten as a *hyperelliptic* curve in terms of the new variable $Y \equiv (\zeta\lambda)^{N_c/2}\left(w - \frac{1}{w}\right)$

$$Y^2 = P^2(\lambda) - 4\zeta^{2N_c}\lambda^{N_c} \tag{5.32}$$

where $\lambda \equiv e^{2\xi}$, ξ is the "true" spectral parameter of the relativistic Toda chain and ζ is its coupling constant.

The difference with the $4d$ case is at the following two points. The first is that this time $s_0 \sim \prod e^{a_i} = 1$ [16] but instead s_{N_c-1} no longer vanishes and becomes a modulus.

---

[16] This formula looks quite natural since the relativistic Toda chain is a sort of "group generalization" of the ordinary Toda chain.

The second new point is that the generating differential instead of (5.22) is now

$$dS^{(5)} = \xi \frac{dw}{w} \sim \log \lambda \frac{dw}{w} \tag{5.33}$$

so that its periods are completely different from those of $dS^{(4)}$. However, the set of holomorphic differentials

$$dv_k = \frac{\partial dS^{(5)}}{\partial s_k} \cong \frac{\lambda^{k-1} d\lambda}{Y}, \quad k = 1, ..., g \tag{5.34}$$

literally coincides with the set (5.24), because k now runs through $1, \ldots, g$ instead of $0, \ldots, g-1$ but there is the extra factor of λ in the denominator. Thus, the algebra of differentials remains just the same closed associative algebra, but the residue formula is a little modified.

Indeed, when passing from the first line of (4.15) to the second line, there will arise the extra factor λ due to the shift of the index of differentials dv_k by 1 in the $5d$ case as compared with the $4d$ one. Thus, finally the residue formula acquires the following form

$$F_{ijk} = \mathop{\mathrm{res}}_{d\lambda=0} \frac{d\omega_i d\omega_j d\omega_k}{\left(\frac{d\lambda}{\lambda}\right)\left(\frac{dw}{w}\right)} = \mathop{\mathrm{res}}_{d\lambda=0} \frac{d\omega_i d\omega_j d\omega_k}{\left(\frac{d\lambda}{\lambda}\right)\left(\frac{dP}{Y}\right)} = \sum_\alpha \lambda_\alpha \frac{\hat{\omega}_i(\lambda_\alpha)\hat{\omega}_j(\lambda_\alpha)\hat{\omega}_k(\lambda_\alpha)}{P'(\lambda_\alpha)/\hat{Y}(\lambda_\alpha)} \tag{5.35}$$

5.5 Pure gauge theory with B_n, C_n and D_n gauge groups

Now we consider shortly the case of the pure gauge theory with the groups $G \neq A_n$. This example is of importance, since it demonstrates that, in the cases when naively there is no closed associative algebra of holomorphic 1-differentials, it really exists due to some additional symmetries of the curve.

The curve in this case has the form (5.1) with $Q_0(\lambda) = \lambda^{2s}$ as in (5.4), while the generating differential – (5.2). After change of variables

$$2Y(\lambda) = w - \frac{Q_0(\lambda)}{w} \tag{5.36}$$

the curve acquires the standard hyperelliptic form

$$Y^2 = P^2(\lambda) - Q_0(\lambda) \tag{5.37}$$

Naively, we can repeat the procedure applied in the previous examples. The new problem, however, is that the genus of this curve now is $2n-1$ (see (5.4)), while there are only n moduli, and, therefore, n holomorphic differentials which can be obtained from the generating differential (5.2). Therefore, one might expect that the algebra formed by these differentials is too small to be closed (and associative).

However, it turns out that, due to the additional Z_2-symmetry, this is not the case. Indeed, let us note that the curve (5.37) admits the involution $\rho : \lambda \to -\lambda$ (in addition to that $Y \to -Y$). Therefore, in the complete set of holomorphic σ-odd differentials on the hyperelliptic curve (5.37) (see sect.3.4) $dv_i = \frac{\lambda^i d\lambda}{Y}$, $i = 0, \ldots, 2n-2$, there are $n-1$ ρ-even and $n-1$ ρ-odd differentials. Keeping in mind the rational examples of sect.5.2, we should look at the subalgebra formed by the ρ-odd differentials that only can be obtained from the generating differential dS, i.e. at dv_i with $i = 2k$ – or at the canonical ρ-odd differentials $d\omega_i^o$

$$d\omega_i^o d\omega_j^o = C_{ij}^k d\omega_k^o dW \mod \frac{dw}{w} \tag{5.38}$$

Since $\frac{dw}{w}$ is ρ-even, it can be multiplied only by ρ-even holomorphic differentials. On the other hand, there are $2n-2$ ρ-even quadratic holomorphic differentials. This perfectly matches the number of the free adjusting parameters at the r.h.s. of 5.38), i.e. algebra (5.38) is really closed (and associative, as one can obtain by the analogous counting).

The fact of closeness and associativity of this algebra can be demonstrated in another and easier way – like it has been done in our previous examples. Indeed, let us multiply all the differentials by λY that is the common denominator (since $\frac{dw}{w} = \frac{dP}{Y} + s\left(1 - \frac{P}{Y}\right)\frac{d\lambda}{\lambda}$). Then, the algebra is reduced (as usual in the hyperelliptic case) to the polynomial algebra. More precisely, this is the closed associative algebra of $n-1$ odd polynomials p_i^o of degree $2n-3$ factorized over the ideal which is an even polynomial $\lambda P'(\lambda)$ of the degree $2n$:

$$p_i^o(\lambda)p_j^o(\lambda) = C_{ij}^k p_k^o(\lambda)W(\lambda) + \xi_{ij}^e(\lambda)\lambda P'(\lambda) \tag{5.39}$$

where ξ_{ij}^e is some even polynomial. The degree of this expression is $4n-6$, at the l.h.s. of it there are $2n-3$ independent coefficients of the even polynomial of degree $4n-6$ with no constant term, while at the r.h.s. there are $n-1$ adjusting parameters C_{ij}^k and $n-2$ adjusting coefficients of the polynomial $\xi_{ij}^e(\lambda)$, totally $2n-3$ free parameters. This counting proves that the described algebra is closed (and associative as polynomial algebra).

5.6 Hypermultiplets in the fundamental representation (Spin chains)

To conclude the section, we consider the example of hyperelliptic curve associated with the $SU(N_c)$ Yang-Mills theory with mass hypermultiplets.

The set of holomorphic 1-differentials $\{d\omega_i\}$ relevant in the Toda chain case (s.5.3 and [12]) should be now enlarged to include meromorphic ones, with the simple poles at the points $m_\iota^\pm$. The spectral curve is given by:

$$\mathcal{P}(\lambda, w) = 2P(\lambda) - w - \frac{Q(\lambda)}{w} \tag{5.40}$$

where

$$P(\lambda) = \sum_{k=0}^{N_c} s_k\lambda^k + R(\lambda) \qquad Q(\lambda) = \prod_{s=1}^{N_f}(\lambda - m_\iota) \tag{5.41}$$

s_k are the Schur polynomials of the Hamiltonians h_k and do not depend on m_ι, while $R(\lambda)$ is instead an h_k-independent polynomial in λ of degree $N_c - 1$, which is non-vanishing only for $N_f > N_c$ [32] (see also [5]). It is convenient to introduce another function Y

$$2Y = w - \frac{Q(\lambda)}{w}, \qquad Y^2 = P^2(\lambda) - Q(\lambda) = \prod(\lambda - \lambda_\alpha) \tag{5.42}$$

The generating differential

$$dS = \lambda\frac{dw}{w} = \lambda\left(\frac{dP}{Y} - \frac{PdQ}{2QY} + \frac{dQ}{2Q}\right) \tag{5.43}$$

satisfies the defining property

$$\frac{\partial dS}{\partial a_k} = d\omega_k \quad \left(\{dW_a\} = \frac{Pol}{QY}d\lambda\right) \tag{5.44}$$

and the algebra of multiplication acquires the form:

$$dW_a dW_b = C_{ab}^c dW_c dW \bmod \frac{dw}{w} \tag{5.45}$$

$a = 1, \dots, g + N_f = \{i, s\}$, $g = N_c - 1$. The general formulas in the particular case (5.40) are

$$\frac{\partial dS}{\partial a_I} \cong \frac{\frac{\partial P}{\partial a_I} - \frac{1}{2w}\frac{\partial Q}{\partial a_I}}{P' - \frac{Q'}{2w}}\frac{dw}{w} \equiv \mathcal{T}_I\frac{dw}{\mathcal{P}'w} \tag{5.46}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dw}{w} &= \frac{dP}{Y} - \frac{dQ}{2Y(P+Y)} \\ Y\frac{dw}{w}\bigg|_{Y=0} &= dP - \frac{dQ}{2P} \end{aligned} \tag{5.47}$$

The calculations (along the lines of [12]) lead to the same conclusion:

$$a_k = \oint_{A_k} dS, \qquad \oint \frac{\partial\, dS}{\partial s_l} = \oint \frac{\lambda^l d\lambda}{Y} \tag{5.48}$$

$$\frac{\partial F_{ij}}{\partial a_k} = \frac{\partial F_{ij}}{\partial \lambda_\alpha}\frac{\partial \lambda_\alpha}{\partial s_l}\frac{\partial s_l}{\partial a_k} \tag{5.49}$$

The first derivative is (as usual for any hyperelliptic curve) equal to $\hat{\omega}_i\hat{\omega}_j(\lambda_\alpha)$, the last one – to σ^{-1}_{kl}. In order to find the middle one, consider

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial s_l}\left(P^2 - Q = \prod_\beta (\lambda - \lambda_\beta)\right)\Bigg|_{\lambda=\lambda_\alpha} \tag{5.50}$$

It gives

$$2P\frac{\partial P}{\partial s_l} = (2PP' - Q')\frac{\partial \lambda_\alpha}{\partial s_l}\bigg|_{\lambda=\lambda_\alpha} \tag{5.51}$$

i.e.

$$\frac{\partial \lambda_\alpha}{\partial s_l} = \frac{\lambda^l d\lambda}{dP - \frac{1}{2}\frac{dQ}{P}}\Bigg|_{\lambda=\lambda_\alpha} \tag{5.52}$$

Since at $\lambda = \lambda_\alpha$ $Y = 0$, we obtain:

$$\frac{\partial \lambda_\alpha}{\partial s_l} = \frac{\lambda^l_\alpha d\lambda}{Y\frac{dw}{w}}\Bigg|_{\lambda=\lambda_\alpha} = \sigma_{lk}\frac{d\omega_k}{\frac{dw}{w}}\Bigg|_{\lambda=\lambda_\alpha} \tag{5.53}$$

Putting this all together we obtain:

$$\frac{\partial F_{ij}}{\partial a_k} = -\operatorname*{res}_{d\lambda=0}\frac{d\omega_i d\omega_j d\omega_k}{d\lambda\frac{dw}{w}} = \operatorname*{res}_{d\omega=0}\frac{d\omega_i d\omega_j d\omega_k}{d\lambda\frac{dw}{w}} \tag{5.54}$$

Since differentials in the numerator have no poles, the integration contour that goes around the zeroes of $d\lambda$, can be also considered as encircling the zeroes of $d\omega = \frac{dw}{w}$ – and we reproduce the general result (4.15).

The similar identity can be proved for the expressions containing one derivative w.r.t. the remaining moduli $m_\iota \sim \oint dS$, as we can still work with the period matrix. More concretely, since

$$dW_\iota \cong \frac{\partial dS}{\partial m_\iota} \cong -\frac{d\lambda}{w}\frac{\partial w}{\partial m_\iota} = -\frac{d\lambda}{Y}\left(\frac{Q}{2(P+Y)(\lambda - m_\iota)} + \frac{\partial R}{\partial m_\iota}\right) \tag{5.55}$$

the derivative of ramification point is

$$\frac{\partial \lambda_\alpha}{\partial m_\iota} = -\frac{Q}{2P}\frac{d\lambda}{Y\frac{dw}{w}}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda - m_\iota} + \frac{2P\frac{\partial R}{\partial m_\iota}}{Q}\right)\Bigg|_{\lambda=\lambda_\alpha} = -\frac{d\lambda}{Y\frac{dw}{w}}\left(\frac{Q}{2(P+Y)(\lambda - m_\iota)} + \frac{\partial R}{\partial m_\iota}\right)\Bigg|_{\lambda=\lambda_\alpha} = \frac{dW_\iota}{\frac{dw}{w}}\Bigg|_{\lambda=\lambda_\alpha} \tag{5.56}$$

Thus

$$\frac{\partial F_{ij}}{\partial m_\iota} = \frac{\partial F_{ij}}{\partial \lambda_\alpha}\frac{\partial \lambda_\alpha}{\partial m_\iota} = -\operatorname*{res}_{d\lambda=0}\frac{d\omega_i d\omega_j dW_\iota}{d\lambda\frac{dw}{w}} = \operatorname*{res}_{\frac{dw}{w}=0}\frac{d\omega_i d\omega_j dW_\iota}{d\lambda\frac{dw}{w}} \tag{5.57}$$

again in accordance with (4.15). Note, that according to our agreements the punctures m_ι are included into the set of zeroes of $d\lambda$ (along with ramification points λ_α).

Double and triple-derivatives of $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to the masses m_ι can not be obtained from the ordinary period matrices of the hyperelliptic curves. They can be only evaluated by the general method of s.4. This calculation, which is the subject of the next subsection s.5.7, helps also to illustrate the possible subtleties of the general proof.

Let us note that there are two natural choices of the generating differential dS for the case of theory with fundamental matter. One choice is given by formula (5.43) used throughout this subsection. Another one is given by $dS = \lambda\frac{d\hat{w}}{\hat{w}} = \lambda d\log\frac{P-Y}{P+Y}$, where $\hat{w}$ is defined in another parameterization of the curve $\hat{w} + \frac{1}{\hat{w}} = \frac{P}{\sqrt{Q}}$. The latter choice is usually accepted in the literature [2, 5, 32, 33], and has been used in the course of our perturbative consideration of sect.5.2. Note that the differentials (5.55)

$$dW_\iota^{(1)} \cong -\frac{d\lambda}{Y}\left(\frac{P-Y}{2(\lambda-m_\iota)} + \frac{\partial R}{\partial m_\iota}\right) = dW_\iota^{(2)} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{d\lambda}{\lambda-m_\iota} \tag{5.58}$$

have poles at m_ι on one of the sheets, while the differentials $dW_\iota^{(2)}$ associated with the other dS possess the poles on both sheets. However, these two choices give rise to the identical results.

5.7 Residue formula for mass differentials

To make our consideration of concrete examples exhaustive, in this subsection we discuss the subtle points arising in the course of the derivation of the residue formula when two or all the three differentials dv_I are associated with punctures (masses). This is the case, when the Σ-term (4.12) contributes to the result. In what follows we demonstrate how this specific case of the residue formula can be treated in the example of the theory with matter hypermultiplet in the fundamental representation, and we start with consideration of the perturbative limit. To match the notations of sect.5.2, we use the generating differential $dS = \lambda\frac{d\hat{w}}{\hat{w}} = -\frac{1}{2}\lambda d\log\frac{P-Y}{P+Y}$ and, accordingly, the holomorphic differentials $dW_\iota^{(2)} \cong -\frac{P}{2Y}\frac{d\lambda}{(\lambda-m_\iota)} - \frac{\partial R}{\partial m_\iota}\frac{d\lambda}{Y}$. Then, in the perturbative limit this dW_ι acquires the form (5.15), $s_\iota = \lambda_\iota$.

First, we derive formula (4.14) in the perturbative limit with two mass differentials. The symmetry of the l.h.s. of (4.14) w.r.t. the permutations of indices is not obvious, since there are no symmetric terms in the l.h.s. of (4.14) and one needs to consider the entire sum. Therefore, in illustrative purposes, we discuss here all possible arranging of indices in (4.14) – $\{KLM\} = \{\iota,\iota,\iota'\}$, $\{KLM\} = \{\iota,\iota',\iota\}$ and $\{KLM\} = \{\iota',\iota,\iota\}$ checking that they lead to the same result. Note that the term $\oint_{A_I}\frac{\partial dv_L}{\partial s_M}\int_{\frac{\partial B_I}{\partial s_K}} dS$ is zero in all the cases considered below. Other terms are equal to

$$\Sigma^{(1)}_{KLM} \equiv \operatorname*{res}_{\frac{\partial v_L}{\partial\lambda_M}=0}\left(dv_K\frac{\partial v_L}{\partial\lambda_M}\right) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{when}\quad K=L=\iota,\ M=\iota' \\ 0 & \text{when}\quad K=M=\iota,\ L=\iota' \\ -\dfrac{1}{4}\dfrac{1}{\lambda_{\iota\iota'}} & \text{when}\quad L=M=\iota,\ K=\iota' \end{cases} \tag{5.59}$$

$$\Sigma^{(2)}_{KLM} \equiv \sum_I \oint_{A_I} dv_K\frac{\partial}{\partial s_M}\int_{\frac{\partial B_I}{\partial\lambda_L}} dS = \begin{cases} -\dfrac{1}{4}\dfrac{1}{\lambda_{\iota\iota'}} & \text{when}\quad K=L=\iota,\ M=\iota' \\ 0 & \text{when}\quad K=M=\iota,\ L=\iota' \\ 0 & \text{when}\quad L=M=\iota,\ K=\iota' \end{cases} \tag{5.60}$$

$$\Sigma^{(3)}_{KLM} \equiv \sum_I \oint_{A_I} dv_K \int_{\frac{\partial B_I}{\partial \lambda_M}} dv_L = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{when} \quad K = L = \iota,\ M = \iota' \\ -\dfrac{1}{4}\dfrac{1}{\lambda_{\iota\iota'}} & \text{when} \quad K = M = \iota,\ L = \iota' \\ 0 & \text{when} \quad L = M = \iota,\ K = \iota' \end{cases} \tag{5.61}$$

since $\oint_{A_I} dv_\iota = -\frac{1}{2}\delta_{I\iota}$, $\int_{\frac{\partial B_I}{\partial \lambda_\iota}} dv_{\iota'} = \frac{1}{2}\delta_{I\iota}\frac{1}{\lambda_{\iota\iota'}}$ and $\int_{\frac{\partial B_I}{\partial \lambda_\iota}} dS = \delta_{I\iota} \log\left(\frac{P(\lambda)}{\sqrt{Q(\lambda)}}\right)\Big|_{\lambda=\lambda_\iota}$.

The sum of $\Sigma^{(1)} + \Sigma^{(2)} + \Sigma^{(3)}$ in each of the three cases $K = L$, $K = M$ and $L = M$ is the same how it is required by the symmetricity w.r.t. the permutations of indices. This sum is actually equal to $F_{\iota\iota'}$ in (5.17).

Analogously, one can check the residue formula for three coinciding mass differentials. Then, the result looks like

$$\begin{gathered} \Sigma^{(1)}_{\iota\iota\iota} = -\frac{1}{4}\text{res}\frac{1}{(\lambda-\lambda_\iota)^2} = 0 \\ \Sigma^{(2)}_{\iota\iota\iota} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_i \frac{1}{\lambda_{i\iota}} + \frac{1}{4}\sum_{\iota'\neq\iota}\frac{1}{\lambda_{\iota\iota'}} + \frac{1}{4}\frac{1}{\lambda-\lambda_\iota}\Big|_{\lambda\to\lambda_\iota} \\ \Sigma^{(3)}_{\iota\iota\iota} = -\frac{1}{4}\frac{1}{\lambda-\lambda_\iota}\Big|_{\lambda\to\lambda_\iota} \end{gathered} \tag{5.62}$$

and the sum of these terms is equal to $F_{\iota\iota\iota}$ in (5.17). Let us note that the only role of $\Sigma^{(3)}$ is to cancel the singularity arising in $\Sigma^{(2)}$.

Now we can turn to less trivial case and discuss the residue formula in the hyperelliptic case of sect.5.6. Again, we start with consideration of $F_{\iota'\iota\iota}$. However, this time we restrict ourselves only to the case $L = M$ – the most convenient choice of order of the indices, since it is the case when the only first term in the l.h.s. of (4.14) contributes. In the hyperelliptic case the residue acquires two different contributions. The first one comes from the pole at $\lambda = m_\iota$ and can be obtained with the help of expansion

$$\frac{\partial v_\iota}{\partial m_\iota} \underset{\lambda\to m_\iota}{\longrightarrow} \frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{\lambda-m_\iota} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda - m_\iota) \tag{5.63}$$

Therefore, the contribution of this pole is equal to that in the perturbative case (5.59): $\frac{1}{4}\frac{1}{\lambda_{\iota'\iota}}$. However, now there emerge also some contributions from the ramification points. Indeed,

$$\frac{\partial dv_\iota}{\partial m_\iota} \underset{\lambda\to\lambda_\alpha}{\longrightarrow} \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{P(\lambda_\alpha)}{2(\lambda_\alpha - m_\iota)} + \frac{\partial R(\lambda_\alpha)}{\partial m_\iota}\right)\frac{\partial Y^2}{\partial m_\iota}\frac{d\lambda}{Y^3} = \frac{P(\lambda_\alpha)}{\hat{Y}^3(\lambda_\alpha)}\left(\frac{P(\lambda_\alpha)}{2(\lambda_\alpha - m_\iota)} + \frac{\partial R(\lambda_\alpha)}{\partial m_\iota}\right)\frac{d\lambda}{(\lambda-\lambda_\alpha)^{3/2}} \tag{5.64}$$

since $\frac{\partial Y^2}{\partial m_\iota} = 2P\frac{\partial R}{\partial m_\iota} + \frac{Q}{(\lambda - m_\iota)}$. Therefore,

$$\frac{\partial v_\iota}{\partial m_\iota} \underset{\lambda\to\lambda_\alpha}{\longrightarrow} -2\frac{P(\lambda_\alpha)}{\hat{Y}^4(\lambda_\alpha)}\left(\frac{P(\lambda_\alpha)}{2(\lambda_\alpha - m_\iota)} + \frac{\partial R(\lambda_\alpha)}{\partial m_\iota}\right)^2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda-\lambda_\alpha}} \tag{5.65}$$

and the full answer becomes

$$F_{\iota\iota'} = \Sigma^{(1)}_{\iota'\iota\iota} = 2\sum_\alpha \frac{P(\lambda_\alpha)}{\hat{Y}^4(\lambda_\alpha)}\left(\frac{P(\lambda_\alpha)}{2(\lambda_\alpha - m_\iota)} + \frac{\partial R(\lambda_\alpha)}{\partial m_\iota}\right)^2\left(\frac{P(\lambda_\alpha)}{2(\lambda_\alpha - m_{\iota'})} + \frac{\partial R(\lambda_\alpha)}{\partial m_{\iota'}}\right) - \frac{1}{4}\frac{1}{\lambda_{\iota\iota'}} \tag{5.66}$$

This result should be compared with the residue formula

$$F_{\iota\iota'} = \underset{\frac{dw}{w}=0}{\text{res}} \frac{(dv_\iota)^2 dv_{\iota'}}{d\lambda\frac{dw}{w}} = \underset{\frac{dw}{w}=0}{\text{res}} \frac{1}{Y^2 P}\left(\frac{P}{2(\lambda - m_\iota)} + \frac{\partial R}{\partial m_\iota}\right)^2\left(\frac{P}{2(\lambda - m_{\iota'})} + \frac{\partial R}{\partial m_{\iota'}}\right)\frac{d\lambda}{\left(\log(P/\sqrt{Q})\right)'} \tag{5.67}$$

As we did it earlier, instead of quite involved calculation of this residue at zeroes of $\frac{dw}{w}$, we calculate it in all other poles (i.e. zeroes of $d\lambda$). Since $\left(\log(P/\sqrt{Q})\right)'$ contains $[(\lambda - m_\iota)(\lambda - m_{\iota'})]^{-1}$, only ramification points and $\lambda = m_\iota$ contributes to the result. Using formula

$$\left.\left(\log(P/\sqrt{Q})\right)'\right|_{\lambda=\lambda_\alpha} = \frac{\hat{Y}^2(\lambda_\alpha)}{2P^2(\lambda_\alpha)} \tag{5.68}$$

one can easily check that this really gives (5.66).

Analogously one can study in the hyperelliptic case the residue formula for the three coinciding differentials $F_{\iota\iota\iota}$. This time the calculation is a little longer. Using (5.63), one gets for $\Sigma^{(1)}_{\iota\iota\iota}$

$$\Sigma^{(1)}_{\iota\iota\iota} = 2\sum_\alpha \frac{P(\lambda_\alpha)}{\hat{Y}^4(\lambda_\alpha)}\left(\frac{P(\lambda_\alpha)}{2(\lambda_\alpha - m_\iota)} + \frac{\partial R(\lambda_\alpha)}{\partial m_\iota}\right)^3 - \frac{1}{2P(m_\iota)}\frac{\partial R(m_\iota)}{\partial m_\iota} - \left.\frac{1}{4}\frac{\partial(P/Y)}{\partial\lambda}\right|_{\lambda=m_\iota} \tag{5.69}$$

i.e. the sum over ramification points looks similar to the case of two coinciding differentials. Other Σ terms are even simpler:

$$\Sigma^{(2)}_{\iota\iota\iota} = -\left.\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial P/\partial\lambda}{P}\right|_{\lambda=m_\iota} - \frac{1}{2P(m_\iota)}\frac{\partial R(m_\iota)}{\partial m_\iota} + \frac{1}{4}\sum_{\iota'\neq\iota}\frac{1}{\lambda_{\iota\iota'}} + \left.\frac{1}{4}\frac{1}{\lambda - \lambda_\iota}\right|_{\lambda\to\lambda_\iota} \tag{5.70}$$

$$\Sigma^{(3)}_{\iota\iota\iota} = -\frac{1}{2P(m_\iota)}\frac{\partial R(m_\iota)}{\partial m_\iota} - \left.\frac{1}{4}\frac{1}{\lambda - \lambda_\iota}\right|_{\lambda\to\lambda_\iota} \tag{5.71}$$

The sum of all the three terms should be compared with the residue formula

$$F_{\iota\iota\iota} = \operatorname*{res}_{\frac{dw}{w}=0}\frac{(dv_\iota)^3}{d\lambda\frac{dw}{w}} = -\operatorname*{res}_{\frac{dw}{w}=0}\frac{1}{Y^2P}\left(\frac{P}{2(\lambda - m_\iota)} + \frac{\partial R}{\partial m_\iota}\right)^3\frac{d\lambda}{\left(\log(P/\sqrt{Q})\right)'} \tag{5.72}$$

Again taking residues at zeroes of $d\lambda$ and using formulas (5.68) along with

$$\begin{gathered}\left.(\lambda - m_\iota)\left(\log\frac{P}{\sqrt{Q}}\right)'\right|_{\lambda=m_\iota} = -\frac{1}{2}\\ \left.\left[(\lambda - m_\iota)\left(\log\frac{P}{\sqrt{Q}}\right)'\right]'\right|_{\lambda=m_\iota} = \left.\frac{\partial P/\partial\lambda}{P}\right|_{\lambda=m_\iota} - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\iota'\neq\iota}\frac{1}{\lambda_{\iota\iota'}}\end{gathered} \tag{5.73}$$

one finally proves that (5.72) is really equal to the sum of (5.69), (5.70) and (5.71). Contributions from the ramification points into (5.72) entirely originate from analogous term in $\Sigma^{(1)}_{\iota\iota\iota}$, and all the terms in Σ's proportional to $\partial R/\partial m_\iota$ come from the first order pole at $\lambda = m_\iota$. The remaining terms in $\Sigma^{(1)}$ and $\Sigma^{(2)}$ are equal to the residue of the second order pole at $\lambda = m_\iota$.

6 Hypermultiplet in the adjoint representation (Calogero system)

6.1 General formulas

To conclude our examples, in this section we discuss in detail the case of Calogero system when the closed algebra exists but is *not* associative, how it was discussed in sect.3-4. The physics os this example is the $4d$ $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY YM model with one matter hypermultiplet in the adjoint representation of the gauge group $SU(N_c)$ that is described in the SW framework by elliptic Calogero model [6, 7, 8]. The bare curve for the UV finite model is elliptic curve (4.1) and its modulus τ can be identified with the bare (UV) coupling constant of the YM theory. The mass of the $4d$ hypermultiplet is proportional to the coupling constant g in Calogero-Moser model. The spectral curve of the elliptic Calogero model

$$\det(\mathcal{L}(x,y)-\lambda)=0 \tag{6.1}$$

is given by

$$\begin{gathered}
y^2=(x-e_1(\tau))(x-e_2(\tau))(x-e_3(\tau))=x^3-\frac{1}{4}g_2(\tau)x-\frac{1}{4}g_3(\tau)\\
\mathcal{P}(\lambda,x)=\sum_{i=0}^{N_c}g^i s_i\mathcal{T}_i(\lambda,x)=0\\
\mathcal{T}_0=1,\quad \mathcal{T}_1=\lambda,\quad \mathcal{T}_2=\lambda^2-x,\quad \mathcal{T}_3=\lambda^3-3\lambda x+2y,\quad \mathcal{T}_4=\lambda^4-6\lambda^2x+8\lambda y-3(x^2+\mu_4),\\
\mathcal{T}_5=\lambda^5-10\lambda^3x+20\lambda^2y-15\lambda(x^2+\mu_4)+4xy,\qquad \mathcal{T}_6=\lambda^6-15\lambda^4x+40\lambda^3y-45\lambda^2(x^2+\mu_4)+24\lambda xy-5,\\
\ldots
\end{gathered} \tag{6.2}$$

(we remind that $e_1+e_2+e_3=0$). Using gradation deg $\lambda\;=1$, deg $x\;=2$, deg $y\;=3$, …, $\mathcal{T}_i$ becomes a homogeneous polynomial of degree i. Actually this is a "semi"-gradation from the point of view of x and y, because some coefficients also have non-vanishing (but always positive) degree: deg $e_i(\tau)=2$, deg $\mu_4=4$ etc. As functions of λ, the $\mathcal{T}_i$ behave similar to the Schur polynomials:

$$\mathcal{T}_i'\equiv\frac{\partial\mathcal{T}_i}{\partial\lambda}=i\mathcal{T}_{i-1}. \tag{6.3}$$

As a corollary, $\mathcal{P}'$ is again a linear combination of $\mathcal{T}_i$:

$$\mathcal{P}'\equiv\frac{\partial\mathcal{P}}{\partial\lambda}=\sum_i ig^is_i\mathcal{T}_{i-1}. \tag{6.4}$$

For our purposes we can absorb g_i in (6.2) into the moduli s_i.

The full spectral curve (6.2) is a N_c-fold covering of bare elliptic curve, which has genus N_c (not $\sim N_c^2/2$ as one could naively expect), due to specific properties of the functions $\mathcal{T}_i$ which may be demonstrated in the Hitchin-like interpretation of Calogero model, when the matrix-valued moment map is restricted to have a pole with N_c-1 coinciding eigenvalues at it. In the limit $x\sim\frac{1}{\xi^2}\to\infty$, the coordinate $\lambda\sim\frac{1}{\xi}$ on the N_c-1 sheets and $\lambda\sim-\frac{N_c-1}{\xi}$ on the last sheet. We shall refer to these to kinds of sheets as "+" and "−" respectively. On the N_c-1 "+" sheets all the functions $\mathcal{T}_i$ behave as

$$\mathcal{T}_i\sim\lambda \tag{6.5}$$

in the limit $\lambda\longrightarrow\infty$, while on the "−" sheet $\mathcal{T}_i\sim\lambda^i$. Since $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{P}'$ are both linear combinations of $\mathcal{T}_i$, they have the same asymptotics $\sim\lambda^1$ on the "+" sheet.

For the generating form $dS=\lambda d\omega=\lambda\frac{dx}{y}$, we have

$$dv_k=\frac{\partial dS}{\partial s_k}=-\frac{\mathcal{T}_kd\omega}{\mathcal{P}'},\quad k=0,1,2,\ldots,N_c-2. \tag{6.6}$$

The complete basis of N_c holomorphic 1-differentials on $\mathcal{C}$ consists of dv_k with $k=0,1,2,\ldots,N_c-2,N_c-1$. The holomorphic 1-differential dv_{N_c-1} is (up to addition of other dv_k with $k\leq N_c-2$) equal to $d\omega=\frac{dx}{y}$. The only non-vanishing integrals of $d\omega$ are along the cycles on the *bare* spectral curve $E(\tau)$. The periods a_i relevant for the SW theory are instead associated with the other cycles, which turn to be trivial after projection on $E(\tau)$ (see sect.8 of [8] for discussion of the $N_c = 2$ example).

In other words, the polynomial $\mathcal{T}_{N_c-1}$ is linearly equivalent to a combination of $\mathcal{T}_i$ with $i < N_c - 1$ *modulo* $\mathcal{P}'$. At the same time this is not true for $\mathcal{T}_{N_c}$, despite it is of degree N_c in λ, while $\mathcal{P}'$ is only of degree $N_c - 1$ – this is because $\mathcal{T}_i$ are polynomials of several variables. (In fact $\mathcal{T}_i$ is a pair of homogeneous polynomials of two variables, λ and x, it is a *pair*, because coefficients in front of y^0 and y^1 are independent polynomials.)

One does not expect such polynomials to form a closed algebra modulo a single polynomial $\mathcal{P}'$,

$$\mathcal{T}_i\mathcal{T}_j = C_{ij}^k\mathcal{T}_k\mathcal{T} \text{ mod } \mathcal{P}' \tag{6.7}$$

instead one would rather expect a closed algebra modulo *two* polynomials, $\mathcal{P}' = \partial\mathcal{P}/\partial\lambda$ and $\dot{\mathcal{P}} = y\partial\mathcal{P}/\partial x$,

$$\mathcal{T}_i\mathcal{T}_j = C_{ij}^k\mathcal{T}_k\mathcal{T} \text{ mod } (\mathcal{P}', \dot{\mathcal{P}}), \qquad \mathcal{T} = \sum_{k=0}^{N_c} q_k\mathcal{T}_k \tag{6.8}$$

Such an algebra indeed exists, due to the general arguments of sect.4. Technically this happens because of specific properties (6.3) and (6.5) of $\mathcal{T}_k$.

The main thing is that among quadratic combinations $\mathcal{T}_i\mathcal{T}_j$ there are only few linear independent. Because of the (semi) gradation $\mathcal{T}_i\mathcal{T}_j$ can be expressed only through the combinations of the same (or smaller) degree $r = i + j$, and actually one can express everything in terms of, say, $\mathcal{T}_0\mathcal{T}_r = \mathcal{T}_r$ and $\mathcal{T}_1\mathcal{T}_{r-1} = \lambda\mathcal{T}_{r-1}$. This of course follows from the counting of holomorphic quadratic differentials, but can be also checked directly, using explicit expressions (6.2) for $\mathcal{T}_k$. The first linear independent combinations are:

$$\begin{array}{lll}
\text{deg } 0: & \mathcal{T}_0 = 1; & \\
\text{deg } 1: & \mathcal{T}_1 = \lambda; & \\
\text{deg } 2: & \mathcal{T}_2 = \lambda^2 - x,\ \mathcal{T}_1^2 = \lambda^2; & \\
\text{deg } 3: & \mathcal{T}_3,\ \mathcal{T}_1\mathcal{T}_2; & \\
\text{deg } 4: & \mathcal{T}_4,\ \mathcal{T}_1\mathcal{T}_3,\ \mathcal{T}_2^2; & \mathcal{T}_4 = \mathcal{T}_1\mathcal{T}_3 - 3\mathcal{T}_2^2 - 3\mu_4; \\
\text{deg } 5: & \mathcal{T}_5,\ \mathcal{T}_1\mathcal{T}_4,\ \mathcal{T}_2\mathcal{T}_3; & \mathcal{T}_5 = 3\mathcal{T}_1\mathcal{T}_4 - 2\mathcal{T}_2\mathcal{T}_3 - 6\mu_4\mathcal{T}_1; \\
 & \ldots &
\end{array} \tag{6.9}$$

As we shall see in the subsequent subsections, the combination $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_\omega \equiv \dot{\mathcal{P}} - x\mathcal{P}'$ is always a linear combination of $\mathcal{T}_i\mathcal{T}_j$, and this is enough to make the algebra (6.8) *closed.* We demonstrate this explicitly for the first non-trivial cases of $N_c = 3$ and $N_c = 4$. However, the algebra is non-associative, starting from $N_c = 4$, and again this is checked by explicit calculation (which is somewhat tedious and is actually performed with the help of computer). These examples can also help to illustrate some (possibly obscure) aspects of the reasoning in sect.4. Moreover, we begin from the case $N_c = 2$, which is also instructive for the future studies of the *physical* properties of the UV-finite theories. Results in this case can be directly compared with those of instanton calculus – once they will be obtained for the case of matter in the adjoint representation. Of course, nothing interesting can be said about the WDVV equations and even the algebra of differentials for $N_c = 2$, but one can shed new light on residue formulas – as well as on some other aspects of the SW theory.

6.2 Residue formula: example for $N_c = 2$

In the case of the gauge group $SU(2)$ the full spectral curve is the double covering of the torus $E(\tau)$:

$$\mathcal{P}^{N_c=2}(\lambda; x, y) = \lambda^2 - g^2 x + s_0 = 0 \tag{6.10}$$

The generating differential is

$$dS = \lambda d\omega = \frac{\sqrt{s_0 - g^2 x}dx}{y} \tag{6.11}$$

and the prepotential is given by

$$F = \frac{1}{2}\left(\oint_A dS \oint_B dS + \oint_{\lambda=\infty} dS \left(\int_{\lambda=-\infty+\varepsilon}^{\lambda=+\infty-\varepsilon} dS - g\log\varepsilon \right)\Bigg|_{\varepsilon=0} \right) \tag{6.12}$$

The derivative

$$dv = \frac{\partial dS}{\partial s_0} = \frac{d\omega}{2\lambda} = \frac{dx}{2\lambda y} = \frac{dx}{2y\sqrt{s_0 - g^2 x}} \tag{6.13}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial a}{\partial s_0} = \frac{\partial}{\partial s_0}\oint_A dS = \oint_A \frac{dx}{2\lambda y} \qquad \frac{\partial}{\partial a} = \left(\oint_A \frac{dx}{2\lambda y}\right)^{-1}\frac{\partial}{\partial s_0} \tag{6.14}$$

Since dS and dv are both $(1,0)$-differentials, $dS \wedge dv = 0$, and

$$0 = \int_{\mathcal{C}} dS \wedge dv = \oint_A dS \oint_B dv - \oint_B dS \oint_A dv + \oint_{\lambda=\infty} dS \int_{\lambda=-\infty}^{\lambda=+\infty} dv \tag{6.15}$$

The r.h.s. is the result of application of the Stokes theorem to the total derivative $dS \wedge dv = d(Sdv)$ on a simply-connected surface, obtained by cutting the spectral curve $\mathcal{C}$ along A- and B-cycles and, additionally, between the two points $\lambda = \pm\infty$, where dS (but not dv) has simple poles. Eq.(6.15) states that

$$a\frac{\partial a^D}{\partial s_0} - a^D\frac{\partial a}{\partial s_0} + g\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dv = 0, \tag{6.16}$$

thus

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial s_0} = \frac{1}{2}\left(a\frac{\partial a^D}{\partial s_0} + a^D\frac{\partial a}{\partial s_0} + g\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dv \right) = a^D\frac{\partial a}{\partial s_0}, \tag{6.17}$$

i.e.

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial a} = a^D \tag{6.18}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial a^2} = \frac{\partial a^D/\partial s_0}{\partial a/\partial s_0} = \frac{\oint_B \frac{dx}{\lambda y}}{\oint_A \frac{dx}{\lambda y}} \tag{6.19}$$

so that

$$\frac{\partial^3 F}{\partial a^3} = \left(\oint_A \frac{dx}{\lambda y}\right)^{-3}\left(\oint_A \frac{dx}{\lambda y}\oint_B \frac{dx}{\lambda^3 y} - \oint_B \frac{dx}{\lambda y}\oint_A \frac{dx}{\lambda^3 y} \right) \tag{6.20}$$

The next is to express the difference in brackets through the residue at $\lambda = 0$:

$$\frac{\partial^3 F}{\partial a^3} = 2\pi i \left(\oint_A \frac{dx}{\lambda y}\right)^{-3} \operatorname*{res}_{\lambda=0} \frac{dx}{\lambda^3 y} d^{-1}\frac{dx}{\lambda y} = \left(\oint_A \frac{dx}{2\lambda y}\right)^{-3} \frac{2\pi i}{2y^2\left(x = \frac{s_0}{g^2}\right)} \tag{6.21}$$

(we used the fact that on $\mathcal{C}$ the differential $dx = \frac{2\lambda d\lambda}{g^2}$, and there is an extra factor 2 coming from two sheets of $E(\tau)$).

For illustrative purposes let us represent all formulas in a different way: expand in powers of g^2 using

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda = \sqrt{s_0 - g^2x} &= s_0^{1/2}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{\Gamma(3/2)}{k!\Gamma(3/2-k)}\left(-\frac{g^2x}{s_0}\right)^k = s_0^{1/2}\left(1-\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{(2k-3)!!}{k!}\left(\frac{g^2x}{2s_0}\right)^k\right)\\
\frac{1}{\lambda} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{s_0-g^2x}} &= s_0^{-1/2}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{\Gamma(1/2)}{k!\Gamma(1/2-k)}\left(-\frac{g^2x}{s_0}\right)^k = s_0^{-1/2}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{(2k-1)!!}{k!}\left(\frac{g^2x}{2s_0}\right)^k\\
\frac{1}{\lambda^3} = \frac{1}{(s_0-g^2x)^{3/2}} &= s_0^{-3/2}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{\Gamma(-1/2)}{k!\Gamma(-1/2-k)}\left(-\frac{g^2x}{s_0}\right)^k = s_0^{-3/2}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{(2k+1)!!}{k!}\left(\frac{g^2x}{2s_0}\right)^k
\end{aligned}\tag{6.22}$$

($(-1)!! = 0! = 1$). Among contour integrals $\oint\frac{x^kdx}{y}$ (for a given homotopy class of contours) there are only two independent: for example with $k = 0$ and $k = 1$. All others can be expressed through these ones, using relations

$$\begin{aligned}
dy &= \frac{dx}{2y}(3x^2-\frac{g_2}{4})\\
d(x^{k-2}y) &= \frac{dx}{y}\left(\frac{3}{2}x^k-\frac{g_2}{8}x^{k-2}+(k-2)x^k-(k-2)\frac{g_2}{4}x^{k-2}-(k-2)\frac{g_3}{4}x^{k-3}\right)=\\
&= (k-\frac{1}{2})\frac{dx}{y}\left(x^k-\frac{2k-3}{4(2k-1)}g_2x^{k-2}-\frac{k-2}{2(2k-1)}g_3x^{k-3}\right)
\end{aligned}\tag{6.23}$$

Thus, one can substitute:

$$\begin{aligned}
\oint dv &= \rho\oint\frac{dx}{2y}+\sigma\oint\frac{xdx}{2y},\\
\rho &= \frac{1}{s_0^{1/2}}\left(1+\frac{g_2}{8}\left(\frac{g^2}{2s_0}\right)^2+\frac{g_3}{4}\left(\frac{g^2}{2s_0}\right)^3+\frac{25g_2^2}{384}\left(\frac{g^2}{2s_0}\right)^4+\frac{21g_2g_3}{80}\left(\frac{g^2}{2s_0}\right)^5+\dots\right)\\
\sigma &= \frac{1}{s_0^{1/2}}\left(\left(\frac{g^2}{2s_0}\right)+\frac{3g_2}{8}\left(\frac{g^2}{2s_0}\right)^3+\frac{5g_3}{8}\left(\frac{g^2}{2s_0}\right)^4+\frac{147g_2^2}{640}\left(\frac{g^2}{2s_0}\right)^5+\dots\right)
\end{aligned}\tag{6.24}$$

The conventional notation for the remaining periods in the theory of elliptic functions is:

$$\begin{gathered}
\oint_A\frac{dx}{2y} = \oint_A d\xi = 2\omega \qquad \oint_B\frac{dx}{2y} = 2\omega' = 2\omega\tau\\
\oint_A\frac{xdx}{2y} = \oint_A\wp(\xi)d\xi = \eta(\xi+2\omega)-\zeta(\xi) = 2\hat{\eta}\equiv 2\omega\bar{\eta} \qquad \oint_B\frac{xdx}{2y} = 2\hat{\eta}'\equiv 2\omega\bar{\eta}'\\
\omega' = \omega\tau \qquad \bar{\eta}\omega'-\bar{\eta}'\omega = \omega^{-1}(\hat{\eta}\omega'-\hat{\eta}'\omega) = \frac{i\pi}{2\omega}
\end{gathered}\tag{6.25}$$

so that

$$\frac{\partial^2F}{\partial a^2} = \frac{\oint_B dv}{\oint_A dv} = \frac{\rho\omega'+\sigma\hat{\eta}'}{\rho\omega+\sigma\hat{\eta}} = \tau-\frac{i\pi}{2\omega^2}\frac{\sigma}{\rho+\sigma\bar{\eta}}\tag{6.26}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial^3F}{\partial a^3} &= -\frac{i\pi}{2\omega^2}(\rho+\sigma\bar{\eta})^{-2}\left(\rho\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial a}-\sigma\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial a}\right) = -\frac{i\pi}{4\omega^3}(\rho+\sigma\bar{\eta})^{-3}\left(\rho\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial s_0}-\sigma\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial s_0}\right)=\\
&= 2\pi i\left(\oint_A dv\right)^{-3}\left(\rho\frac{\sigma\partial\rho-\rho\partial\sigma}{\partial s_0}\right)
\end{aligned}\tag{6.27}$$

In order to reproduce (6.21), it remains to check that the difference in brackets is indeed equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2g^4y^2(x=\frac{s_0}{g^2})} &= \frac{g^2}{2\prod_{i=1}^3(s_0-g^2e_i(\tau))} =\\
&= \frac{g^2}{2s_0^3}\left(1+g_2\left(\frac{g^2}{2s_0}\right)^2+2g_3\left(\frac{g^2}{2s_0}\right)^3+g_2^2\left(\frac{g^2}{2s_0}\right)^4+4g_2g_3\left(\frac{g^2}{2s_0}\right)^5+\dots\right)
\end{aligned}\tag{6.28}$$

what is easy to do with the help of expansions (6.24).

From (6.26), with [17]

$$\alpha \equiv -\frac{m^2}{16s_0} = \left(\frac{\pi}{2\omega}\right)^2 \frac{g^2}{2s_0} = \frac{g^2}{2(g^2\bar{\eta} + \tilde{s}_0)} = \frac{\tilde{\alpha}}{1 + 2\eta\tilde{\alpha}} \tag{6.29}$$

$\tilde{\alpha} \equiv -\frac{m^2}{16\tilde{s}_0}$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta &\equiv \left(\frac{2\omega}{\pi}\right)^2 \frac{\hat{\eta}}{\omega} \\
\frac{\hat{\eta}}{\omega} &= -\frac{\pi^2}{12w_1^2}\frac{\theta_{11}'''(0)}{\theta_{11}'(0)} = \left(\frac{\pi}{2\omega}\right)^2 \left(\frac{1}{3} + O(q^2)\right) \\
g_2 &= \left(\frac{\pi}{2\omega}\right)^4 \left(\frac{4}{3} + O(q^2)\right) \\
g_3 &= \left(\frac{\pi}{2\omega}\right)^6 \left(-\frac{8}{27} + O(q^2)\right) \\
&\dots
\end{aligned} \tag{6.30}$$

we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
T \equiv \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial a^2} &= \tau - \frac{2i}{\pi}\left(\alpha - \eta\alpha^2 + (\eta^2 + \frac{g_2}{4})\alpha^3 - (\eta^3 + \frac{\eta g_2}{2} - \frac{3g_3}{8})\alpha^4 + (\eta^4 + \frac{3\eta^2 g_2}{4} - \frac{3\eta g_3}{4} + \frac{2g_2^2}{15}) + \dots\right) = \\
&= \tau - \frac{2i}{\pi}\left(\tilde{\alpha} - 3\eta\tilde{\alpha}^2 + (9\eta^2 + \frac{g_2}{4})\tilde{\alpha}^3 - (27\eta^3 + 2\eta g_2 - \frac{3g_3}{8})\tilde{\alpha}^4 + (81\eta^4 + \frac{43}{4}\eta^2 g_2 - \frac{15}{4}\eta g_3 + \frac{2}{15}g_2^2)\tilde{\alpha}^5 + \dots\right) = \\
&= \tau - \frac{2i}{\pi}\left(\tilde{\alpha} - \tilde{\alpha}^2 + \frac{4}{3}\tilde{\alpha}^3 - 2\tilde{\alpha}^4 + \frac{16}{5}\tilde{\alpha}^5 + \dots\right) + O(q^2) = \\
&= \tau - \frac{i}{2\pi}\log(1 + 2\tilde{\alpha}) + O(q^2)
\end{aligned} \tag{6.31}$$

Further,

$$\begin{aligned}
a = \oint_A \lambda\frac{dx}{2y} &= s_0^{1/2}\left(1 - \frac{1}{24}\alpha^2 g_2 - \frac{1}{20}\alpha^3 g_3 - \frac{25}{12\cdot 8\cdot 28}\alpha^4 g_2^2 - \dots\right)\oint_A \frac{dx}{2y} - \\
&-s_0^{1/2}\left(\alpha + \frac{3}{40}\alpha^3 g_2 + \frac{5}{7\cdot 8}\alpha^4 g_3 + \dots\right)\oint_A \frac{xdx}{2y} = \\
&= s_0^{1/2}\left(1 - \alpha\eta - \frac{1}{24}\alpha^2 g_2 - \alpha^3(\frac{1}{20}g_3 + \frac{3}{40}\eta g_2) - \alpha^4(\frac{25}{12\cdot 8\cdot 28}g_2^2 + \frac{5}{7\cdot 8}g_3\eta) - \dots\right) = \\
&= s_0^{1/2}\sqrt{1 - 2\alpha\eta} + O(q^2) = \tilde{s}_0^{1/2} + O(q^2)
\end{aligned} \tag{6.32}$$

Thus

$$T = \tau - \frac{i}{\pi}\log\left(1 - \frac{m^2}{8a^2}\right) + O(q^2) = \tau + \frac{i}{\pi}\log\frac{a^2}{a^2 - \frac{1}{8}m^2} + O(q^2) \tag{6.33}$$

This establishes the relation between residue formulas, the prepotential and its perturbative approximation – the logarithmic term in (6.33). It would be instructive to find a careful interpretation of entire expansion (6.31) in terms of instanton calculus in the spirit of [35].

6.3 Example: Algebra for $N_c = 3$

In this case, there are only *two* relevant holomorphic differentials: dv_0 and dv_1; the third one, dv_2, is their linear combination *modulo* $d\omega = d\xi$. Thus, there are no interesting WDVV equations for $N_c = 3$, but non-trivial associative algebra with two generators dv_0 and dv_1 does exist and will be explicitly constructed in this subsection.

---

[17] The origin of the shift $s_0 \to \tilde{s}_0$ is explained in detail in [7, 8].

In this particular case, the spectral curve is:

$$\mathcal{P}^3 = \mathcal{T}_3 + s_1\mathcal{T}_1 + s_0\mathcal{T}_0 = \lambda^3 - 3\lambda x + 2y + s_1\lambda + s_0 = 0 \tag{6.34}$$

Thus

$$\mathcal{P}^3_\lambda \equiv \frac{\partial \mathcal{P}_3}{\partial \lambda} = 3\mathcal{T}_2 + s_1\mathcal{T}_0 = 3\left(\lambda^2 - x + \frac{s_1}{3}\right) \tag{6.35}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}^3_\omega &\equiv \frac{\partial \mathcal{P}^3}{\partial \xi} = -6\left(x^2 - \lambda y - \frac{g_2}{12}\right) \\ \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^3_\omega \equiv \mathcal{P}^3_\omega - x\mathcal{P}^3_\lambda &= -3\left(x^2 - 2\lambda y + \lambda^2 x + \frac{s_1}{3}x - \frac{g_2}{6}\right) = \mathcal{T}_4 - \mathcal{T}_1\mathcal{T}_3 - s_1\mathcal{T}_1 + \left(3\mu_4 + \frac{g_2}{2}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{6.36}$$

As $\xi \to 0$, $x = \frac{1}{\xi^2} + O(\xi^2)$, $y = \frac{1}{\xi^3} + O(\xi)$, and

$$\mathcal{P}^3 = \left(\lambda - \frac{1}{\xi}\right)^2\left(\lambda + \frac{2}{\xi}\right) + s_1\lambda + O(\lambda\xi^2, \xi) \tag{6.37}$$

i.e.

$$\lambda = \lambda_+ = \frac{1}{\xi} + \epsilon_0 + \epsilon_1\xi + \epsilon_2\xi^2 + \dots \tag{6.38}$$

with $2\epsilon_0^2 + s_1 = 0$ etc, or

$$\lambda = \lambda_- = -\frac{2}{\xi} + \varepsilon_1\xi + \varepsilon_3\xi^3 + \dots \tag{6.39}$$

(Note that in the particular case of $N_c = 3$ the point $\xi = 0$ is not a branching point of the full spectral curve and ξ is a nice local coordinate on all the three sheets.)

On the "+" sheets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}^3_\lambda &= 3\left(\frac{2\epsilon_0}{\xi} + (2\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_0^2 + \frac{s_1}{3}) + (2\epsilon_2 + 2\epsilon_0\epsilon_1)\xi + O(\xi^2)\right) \\ \mathcal{P}^3_\omega &= 6\left(\frac{\epsilon_0}{\xi^3} + \frac{\epsilon_1}{\xi^2} + \frac{\epsilon_2}{\xi} + O(1)\right) \end{aligned} \tag{6.40}$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^3_\omega = \mathcal{P}^3_\omega - x\mathcal{P}^3_\lambda = -\frac{3\epsilon_0^2 + s_1}{\xi^2} - \frac{6\epsilon_0\epsilon_1}{\xi} + O(1) = -\frac{6\epsilon_0\epsilon_1}{\xi} + O(1) \tag{6.41}$$

Thus

$$d\lambda + x d\omega = -\frac{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^3_\omega}{\mathcal{P}^3_\lambda} d\omega = (\epsilon_1 + O(\xi))d\xi \tag{6.42}$$

as it should be ($d\lambda + x d\omega = d(\frac{1}{\xi} + \epsilon_0 + \epsilon_1\xi + \dots) + (\frac{1}{\xi^2} + O(\xi^2))d\xi = (\epsilon_1 + O(1))d\xi$). On the "$-$" sheet

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}^3_\lambda &= \frac{9}{\xi^2} + O(1) \\ \mathcal{P}^3_\omega &= -\frac{18}{\xi^4} + O(\frac{1}{\xi^2}) \\ \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^3_\omega = \mathcal{P}^3_\omega - x\mathcal{P}^3_\lambda &= -\frac{27}{\xi^4} + O(\frac{1}{\xi^2}) \end{aligned} \tag{6.43}$$

again in accordance with

$$d\lambda + x d\omega = -\frac{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^3_\omega}{\mathcal{P}^3_\lambda} d\omega = \left(\frac{3}{\xi^2} + O(1)\right) d\xi \tag{6.44}$$

Algebra of holomorphic differentials

$$dv_i = \frac{\mathcal{T}_i d\omega}{\mathcal{P}^3_\lambda}, \quad i = 0, 1, 2 \tag{6.45}$$

We claim that for any

$$dQ = \hat{q}_0 dv_0 + \hat{q}_1 dv_1 \tag{6.46}$$

and $i, j = 0, 1$

$$dv_i dv_j = \left(\sum_{k=0,1} \hat{C}^k_{ij} dv_k \right) dQ \text{ mod } (d\omega, d\lambda) \tag{6.47}$$

The notations with hats are introduced to point out that we consider the algebra of dv_i's, which are not *canonically* normalized holomorphic differentials $d\omega_i$, but certain moduli-dependent linear combinations of them. The fact that algebra exists for dv_i's implies that the same is true for $d\omega_i$'s, but explicit expressions for dv_i's are simpler (of course, $d\omega_i$'s themselves enter the residue formulas for F_{ijk}).

At the l.h.s. of (6.47) stands some linear combination of *three* linear independent quadratic combinations $\mathcal{T}_0^2$, $\mathcal{T}_0\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_1^2$, i.e. 1, λ and λ^2. At the r.h.s. we have:

$$(\alpha_0\mathcal{T}_0 + \alpha_1\mathcal{T}_1)(\hat{q}_0\mathcal{T}_0 + \hat{q}_1\mathcal{T}_1) + w\tilde{P}^3_\omega \text{ mod } P^3_\lambda \Big|_{\mathcal{P}^3=0} \tag{6.48}$$

If $w = 0$, there is no chance to adjust *two* parameters α_0 and α_1 to match *three* coefficients in front of $\mathcal{T}_0^2$, $\mathcal{T}_0\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_1^2$. w is exactly the necessary third adjustment parameter. However, in order to prove that it can really play this role, one should check that $\mathcal{P}^3_\omega = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^3_\omega$ mod $\mathcal{P}^3_\lambda$ is indeed equivalent to a non-trivial combination of $\mathcal{T}_0^2$, $\mathcal{T}_0\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{T}_1^2$ (if $\mathcal{P}^3 = 0$ and *modulo* $\mathcal{P}^3_\lambda$).

First of all,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^3_\omega\Big|_{\mathcal{P}^3=0} &= 3\left(\lambda^4 - 2\lambda^2 x + x^2 + s_1(\lambda^2 + \frac{x}{3}) + s_0\lambda - \frac{g_2}{6}\right) = \\ &= 3\mathcal{T}_2^2 - s_1\mathcal{T}_2 + 4s_1\mathcal{T}_1^2 + 3s_0\mathcal{T}_1 - \frac{g_2}{2} \end{aligned} \tag{6.49}$$

Alternatively, one can use

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^3_\omega = -\lambda\mathcal{P}^3 + \mathcal{T}_4 + s_1\mathcal{T}_2 + s_0\mathcal{T}_1 + 3(\mu_4 + \frac{g_2}{2}) \tag{6.50}$$

and

$$\mathcal{T}_4 = \mathcal{T}_3\mathcal{T}_1 - 3\mathcal{T}_2^2 - 3\mu_4 \tag{6.51}$$

Second,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_2 &= \frac{1}{3}(\mathcal{P}^3_\lambda - s_1\mathcal{T}_0) = -\frac{s_1}{3} \text{ mod } \mathcal{P}^3_\lambda, \\ \mathcal{T}_2^2 &= \frac{1}{9}(\mathcal{P}^3_\lambda - s_1\mathcal{T}_0)^2 = \frac{s_1^2}{9} \text{ mod } \mathcal{P}^3_\lambda, \end{aligned} \tag{6.52}$$

thus, indeed,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^3_\omega \text{ mod } \mathcal{P}^3_\lambda\Big|_{\mathcal{P}^3=0} = \left(\frac{2s_1^2}{3} - \frac{g_2}{2}\right)\mathcal{T}_0^2 + 3s_0\mathcal{T}_0\mathcal{T}_1 + 4s_1\mathcal{T}_1^2, \tag{6.53}$$

and the r.h.s. of (6.47) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{T}_0^2\left(\hat{q}_0\alpha_0 + (\frac{2s_1^2}{3} - \frac{g_2}{2})w\right) + \\ &+\mathcal{T}_0\mathcal{T}_1\left(\hat{q}_1\alpha_0 + \hat{q}_0\alpha_1 + 3s_0 w\right) + \\ &+\mathcal{T}_1^2\left(\hat{q}_1\alpha_1 + 4s_1 w\right) \end{aligned} \tag{6.54}$$

For any given $dv_i dv_j$ with $i,j=0,1$ at the l.h.s. of (6.47), one can now find α_0, α_1 and w (since determinant $D = 4\hat{q}_0^2 s_1 - 3\hat{q}_0\hat{q}_1 s_0 + \hat{q}_1^2(\frac{2s_1^2}{3} - \frac{g_2}{2})$ is non-vanishing for generic values of moduli s_0 and s_1), α_0 and α_1 being just the corresponding $\hat{C}^0_{ij}$ and $\hat{C}^1_{ij}$. Namely, if the l.h.s. of (6.47) is given by

$$a_{00}\mathcal{T}_0^2 + a_{01}\mathcal{T}_0\mathcal{T}_1 + a_{11}\mathcal{T}_1^2 = a_{00} + a_{01}\lambda + a_{11}\lambda^2 \tag{6.55}$$

we have:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_0 \\ \\ \alpha_1 \\ \\ w \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{D} \begin{pmatrix} 4\hat{q}_0 s_1 - 3\hat{q}_1 s_0 & \hat{q}_1(\dfrac{2s_1^2}{3} - \dfrac{g_2}{2}) & -\hat{q}_0(\dfrac{2s_1^2}{3} - \dfrac{g_2}{2}) \\ -4\hat{q}_1 s_1 & 4\hat{q}_0 s_1 & -3\hat{q}_0 s_0 + \hat{q}_1(\dfrac{2s_1^2}{3} - \dfrac{g_2}{2}) \\ \hat{q}_1^2 & -\hat{q}_0\hat{q}_1 & \hat{q}_0^2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_{00} \\ \\ a_{01} \\ \\ a_{11} \end{pmatrix} \tag{6.56}$$

In this way we obtain for the matrices $(\hat{C}_0)^k_j \equiv \hat{C}^k_{0j}$ and $(\hat{C}_1)^k_j \equiv \hat{C}^k_{1j}$:

$$\begin{gathered} \hat{C}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_0(1) & \alpha_0(\lambda) \\ \\ \alpha_1(1) & \alpha_1(\lambda) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{D} \begin{pmatrix} 4\hat{q}_0 s_1 - 3\hat{q}_1 s_0 & \hat{q}_1(\dfrac{2s_1^2}{3} - \dfrac{g_2}{4}) \\ -4\hat{q}_1 s_1 & 4\hat{q}_0 s_1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \hat{C}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_0(\lambda) & \alpha_0(\lambda^2) \\ \\ \alpha_1(\lambda) & \alpha_1(\lambda^2) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{D} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{q}_1(\dfrac{2s_1^2}{3} - \dfrac{g_2}{4}) & -\hat{q}_0(\dfrac{2s_1^2}{3} - \dfrac{g_2}{4}) \\ 4\hat{q}_0 s_1 & -3\hat{q}_0 s_0 + \hat{q}_1(\dfrac{2s_1^2}{3} - \dfrac{g_2}{4}) \end{pmatrix} \end{gathered} \tag{6.57}$$

It is easy to check that these two matrices commute,

$$\hat{C}_0\hat{C}_1 = \hat{C}_1\hat{C}_0 \tag{6.58}$$

(in fact, $\hat{q}_0\hat{C}_0 + \hat{q}_1\hat{C}_1 = I$), what is equivalent to associativity of the algebra

$$dv_i \circ dv_j = \sum_{k=0,1} \hat{C}^k_{ij} dv_k \tag{6.59}$$

6.4 Example: Algebra for $N_c = 4$

In this case there are *three* relevant holomorphic differentials: dv_0, dv_1 and dv_2, while the fourth one, dv_3, is their linear combination *modulo* $d\omega = d\xi$. Thus, this is the simplest example where non-trivial WDVV equation could exist. The purpose of this subsection is to give explicit realization of the closed algebra with three generators dv_0, dv_1 and dv_2 which is really *not* associative. We shall closely follow the presentation in the previous subsection.

The spectral curve:

$$\begin{gathered} \mathcal{P}^4 = \mathcal{T}_4 + s_2\mathcal{T}_2 + s_1\mathcal{T}_1 + s_0\mathcal{T}_0 = \\ = \lambda^4 - 6\lambda^2 x + 8\lambda y - 3(x^2 + \mu_4) + s_2(\lambda^2 - x) + s_1\lambda + s_0 = 0. \end{gathered} \tag{6.60}$$

The choice of the τ-dependent parameter μ_4 depends on the particular way of separating s_i and τ dependencies [7], which we keep unspecified.

$$\begin{gathered} \mathcal{P}^4_\lambda \equiv \frac{\partial \mathcal{P}^4}{\partial \lambda} = 4\mathcal{T}_3 + 2s_2\mathcal{T}_1 + s_1\mathcal{T}_0 = \\ = 4\left(\lambda^3 - 3\lambda x + 2y + \frac{s_2}{2}\lambda + \frac{s_1}{4}\right) \end{gathered} \tag{6.61}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}^4_\omega &\equiv \frac{\partial \mathcal{P}^4}{\partial \xi} = 12\left(\lambda^2 y - 2\lambda(x^2 - \frac{g_2}{12}) + xy + \frac{s_2}{6}y\right),\\ \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^4_\omega &\equiv \mathcal{P}^4_\omega - x\mathcal{P}^4_\lambda = 4\left(xy - 3\lambda x^2 + 3\lambda^2 y - \lambda^3 x + \frac{s_2}{2}(y-\lambda x) - \frac{s_1}{4}x + \frac{g_2}{2}\lambda\right) = \\ &= \mathcal{T}_5 - \mathcal{T}_1\mathcal{T}_4 + s_2(\mathcal{T}_3 - \mathcal{T}_1\mathcal{T}_2) + 2(\mu_4 + g_2)\mathcal{T}_1\end{aligned} \tag{6.62}$$

The $\xi \to 0$ limit As $\xi \to 0$, $x = \frac{1}{\xi^2} + O(\xi^2)$, $y = \frac{1}{\xi^3} + O(\xi)$, and

$$\mathcal{P}^4 = \left(\lambda - \frac{1}{\xi}\right)^3\left(\lambda + \frac{3}{\xi}\right) + s_2\left(\lambda - \frac{1}{\xi}\right)\left(\lambda + \frac{1}{\xi}\right) + s_1\lambda + O(\lambda\xi), \tag{6.63}$$

i.e.

$$\lambda = \lambda_+ = \frac{1}{\xi} + \epsilon_0 + \epsilon_1\xi + \epsilon_2\xi^2 + \ldots; \tag{6.64}$$

with $4\epsilon_0^3 + 2s_2\epsilon_0^2 + s_1 = 0$ etc, *or*

$$\lambda = \lambda_- = -\frac{3}{\xi} + \varepsilon_1\xi + \varepsilon_2\xi^2 + \ldots \tag{6.65}$$

(Note that if all the moduli $s_i = 0$, on the "+" branches expansion would be rather in powers of $\xi^{1/3}$, i.e. $\xi = 0$ would be a branching point where three of the four sheets are glued together. We, however, assume that $s_i \neq 0$.)

On the "+" sheets

$$\begin{gathered}\mathcal{P}^4_\lambda = 4\left(\frac{3\epsilon_0^2 + \frac{s_0}{2}}{\xi} + (6\epsilon_0\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_0^3 + \frac{s_2}{2}\epsilon_0 + \frac{s_1}{4}) + (6\epsilon_0\epsilon_2 + 3\epsilon_1^2 + \epsilon_0^2\epsilon_1 + \frac{s_2}{2}\epsilon_1)\xi + O(\xi^2)\right);\\ \mathcal{P}^3_\omega = 12\left(\frac{\epsilon_0^2 + \frac{s_2}{6}}{\xi^3} + \frac{2\epsilon_0\epsilon_1}{\xi^2} + O(\frac{1}{\xi})\right);\end{gathered} \tag{6.66}$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^4_\omega = \mathcal{P}^4_\omega - x\mathcal{P}^4_\lambda = -\frac{4\epsilon_0^3 + 2s_2\epsilon_0 + s_1}{\xi^2} + O(\frac{1}{\xi}) = O(\frac{1}{\xi}) \tag{6.67}$$

Thus,

$$d\lambda + xd\omega = -\frac{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^4_\omega}{\mathcal{P}^4_\lambda}d\omega = O(1)d\xi, \tag{6.68}$$

as it should be ($d\lambda + xd\omega = d(\frac{1}{\xi} + \epsilon_0 + \epsilon_1\xi + \ldots) + (\frac{1}{\xi^2} + O(\xi^2))d\xi = (\epsilon_1 + O(1))d\xi$).

On the "−" sheet

$$\begin{gathered}\mathcal{P}^4_\lambda = -\frac{64}{\xi^3} + O(\frac{1}{\xi});\\ \mathcal{P}^4_\omega = \frac{192}{\xi^5} + O(\frac{1}{\xi^3});\\ \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^4_\omega = \mathcal{P}^4_\omega - x\mathcal{P}^4_\lambda = \frac{256}{\xi^5} + O(\frac{1}{\xi^3}),\end{gathered} \tag{6.69}$$

again in accordance with

$$d\lambda + xd\omega = -\frac{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^4_\omega}{\mathcal{P}^4_\lambda}d\omega = \left(\frac{N_c}{\xi^2} + O(1)\right)d\xi = \left(\frac{4}{\xi^2} + O(1)\right)d\xi \tag{6.70}$$

Algebra of holomorphic differentials

$$dv_i = \frac{\mathcal{T}_i d\omega}{\mathcal{P}^4_\lambda}, \quad i = 0,1,2,3 \tag{6.71}$$

We claim that for any

$$dQ = \hat{q}_0 dv_0 + \hat{q}_1 dv_1 + \hat{q}_2 dv_2 \tag{6.72}$$

and $i, j = 0, 1, 2$

$$dv_i dv_j = \left(\sum_{k=0,1,2} \hat{C}_{ij}^k dv_k \right) dQ \text{ mod } (d\omega, d\lambda) \tag{6.73}$$

At the l.h.s. of (6.73) there are some linear combination of *six* linear independent quadratic combinations $\mathcal{T}_0^2$, $\mathcal{T}_0\mathcal{T}_1$, $\mathcal{T}_0\mathcal{T}_2$, $\mathcal{T}_1^2$, $\mathcal{T}_1\mathcal{T}_2$ and $\mathcal{T}_2^2$, i.e. 1, λ, $\lambda^2 - x$, λ^2, $\lambda(\lambda^2 - x)$ and $(\lambda^2 - x)^2$. At the r.h.s. we have:

$$(\alpha_0\mathcal{T}_0 + \alpha_1\mathcal{T}_1 + \alpha_2\mathcal{T}_2)(\hat{q}_0\mathcal{T}_0 + \hat{q}_1\mathcal{T}_1 + \hat{q}_2\mathcal{T}_2) + (w_0\mathcal{T}_0 + w_1\mathcal{T}_1)\tilde{P}_\omega^3 \text{ mod } P_\lambda^3 \Big|_{\mathcal{P}^3=0} \tag{6.74}$$

If $w = 0$, there is no possibility to adjust *three* parameters α_0, α_1 and α_2 to match *six* coefficients in front of the relevant combinations $\mathcal{T}_i\mathcal{T}_j$. w_0 and w_1 are additional *two* adjustment parameters, and there is actually no need for the sixth one, since $\mathcal{T}_2^2$ is actually reducible to a linear combination of the other five quadratic combinations. Thus we should check that $\mathcal{P}_\omega^4 = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_\omega^4$ mod $\mathcal{P}_\lambda^4$ and also $\mathcal{T}_2^2$ are equivalent to non-trivial combination of $\mathcal{T}_0^2$, $\mathcal{T}_0\mathcal{T}_1$, $\mathcal{T}_0\mathcal{T}_2$, $\mathcal{T}_1^2$ and $\mathcal{T}_1\mathcal{T}_2$ (if $\mathcal{P}^4 = 0$ and *modulo* $\mathcal{P}_\lambda^4$).

First of all,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_\omega^4 = -\lambda\mathcal{P}^4 + \mathcal{T}_5 + s_2\mathcal{T}_3 + s_1\mathcal{T}_2 + (s_0 + 12\mu_4 + 2g_2)\mathcal{T}_1 \tag{6.75}$$

Second,

$$\begin{gathered} \mathcal{T}_4 = 4\mathcal{T}_1\mathcal{T}_3 - 3\mathcal{T}_2^2 - 3\mu_4; \\ \mathcal{T}_5 = 3\mathcal{T}_1\mathcal{T}_4 - 2\mathcal{T}_2\mathcal{T}_3 - 6\mu_4\mathcal{T}_1; \\ \mathcal{T}_1\mathcal{T}_5 = 4\mathcal{T}_2\mathcal{T}_4 - 3\mathcal{T}_3^2 + 3\left(-(5\mu_4 + g_2)\mathcal{T}_1^2 + (4\mu_4 + g_2)\mathcal{T}_2\right) - 3g_3 \end{gathered} \tag{6.76}$$

Using these identities, one can get:

$$\begin{gathered} \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_\omega^4 \text{ mod } (\mathcal{P}^4, \mathcal{P}_\lambda^4) = \\ = -2s_2\mathcal{T}_1\mathcal{T}_2 - 3s_1\mathcal{T}_1^2 + \frac{3s_1}{2}\mathcal{T}_2 - (2s_0 + \frac{s_2^2}{2} - 6\mu_4 - 2g_2)\mathcal{T}_1 - \frac{s_1 s_2}{4} \end{gathered} \tag{6.77}$$

and

$$\begin{gathered} \mathcal{T}_1\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_\omega^4 \text{ mod } (\mathcal{P}^4, \mathcal{P}_\lambda^4) = \\ = -3s_1\mathcal{T}_1\mathcal{T}_2 + (\frac{17s_2^2}{12} - 3\mu_4 - g_2 + s_0)\mathcal{T}_1^2 + \\ +(-\frac{4s_2^2}{3} - 4s_0 + 12\mu_4 + 3g_2)\mathcal{T}_2 - s_1 s_2\mathcal{T}_1 - (\frac{4s_0 s_2}{3} - 4s_2\mu_4 + \frac{3s_1^2}{16} + 3g_3) \end{gathered} \tag{6.78}$$

From these relations one can read off the structure constants of the algebra. Since, the formulas are too long we are not going to presented them here. The fact is, however, that the closed algebra exists, the structure constants were explicitly evaluated with the help of the program MAPLE, and we used them to check that the algebra is indeed *non*-associative, because

$$[\hat{C}_0, \hat{C}_1] \sim q_2, \quad [\hat{C}_0, \hat{C}_2] \sim q_1, \quad [\hat{C}_1, \hat{C}_2] \sim q_0 \tag{6.79}$$

(in general, $[C_i, C_j] \sim \oplus_{k \neq i,j} q_k$).

7 Acknowledgments

We are grateful to E.Akhmedov, M.Alishahiha, F.Ardalan, J.De Boer, B.de Wit, B.Dubrovin, A.Gerasimov, A.Gorsky, S.Gukov, J.Harnad, I.Krichever, A.Losev, D.Lüst, Yu.Manin, N.Nekrasov, M.Olshanetsky, A.Orlov, I.Polyubin, A.Rosly, I.Tyutin and A.Zabrodin for useful discussions.

This work was supported by grants RFBR-02-16117, INTAS-93-2058 (A.Mar.), RFBR-96-02-16210(a), INTAS-96-2058 (A.Mir.) and RFBR 96-15-96939 (A.Mor.). A.Mor. also acknowledges the support of DFG and the hospitality of Humboldt University, Berlin, and IFH, Zeuthen.

References

[1] N.Seiberg and E.Witten, Nucl.Phys. **B426** (1994) 19; hep-th/9407087

[2] N.Seiberg and E.Witten, Nucl.Phys. **B431** (1994) 484; hep-th/9408099

[3] A.Gorsky, I.Krichever, A.Marshakov, A.Mironov and A.Morozov, Phys.Lett. **B355** (1995) 466; hep-th/9505035

[4] E.Martinec and N.Warner, hepth/9509161
T.Nakatsu and K.Takasaki, hepth/9509162
A.Marshakov, Mod.Phys.Lett. **A11** (1996) 1169; hep-th/9602005
C.Ann and S.Nam, hepth/9603028

[5] A.Gorsky, A.Marshakov, A.Mironov and A.Morozov, Phys.Lett. **B380** (1996) 75; hep-th/9603140
A.Gorsky, A.Marshakov, A.Mironov and A.Morozov, hepth/9604078

[6] R.Donagi and E.Witten, hepth/9510101
E.Martinec, hepth/9510204
A.Gorsky and A.Marshakov, Phys.Lett. **B375** (1996) 127; hep-th/9510224
E.Martinec and N.Warner, hepth/9511052
H.Itoyama and A.Morozov, hep-th/9601168

[7] H.Itoyama and A.Morozov, hep-th/9511126

[8] H.Itoyama and A.Morozov, hep-th/9512161

[9] I.Krichever and D.Phong, hepth/9604199

[10] A.Marshakov, hepth/9607159; hepth/9610242

[11] N.Nekrasov, preprint ITEP-TH-25/96, hepth/9609219

[12] A.Marshakov, A.Mironov and A.Morozov, hepth/9607109, to appear in Phys.Lett. **B**

[13] E.Witten, Surv.Diff.Geom. **1** (1991) 243

[14] R.Dijkgraaf, E.Verlinde and H.Verlinde, Nucl.Phys. **B352** (1991) 59

[15] G.Bonelli and M.Matone, hepth/9605090

[16] J.de Boer and B.de Wit, private communication

[17] Yu.Manin, *Frobenius manifolds, quantum cohomology and moduli spaces*, Preprint MPI, 1996

[18] M.Kontsevich and Yu.Manin, Comm.Math.Phys. **164** (1994) 525; hep-th/9402147

[19] L.Caporaso and J.Harris, alg-geom/9608025
E.Getzler, alg-geom/9612004

[20] B.Dubrovin, I.Krichever and S.Novikov, in *Sovremennye problemy matematiki (VINITI), Dynamical systems - 4* (1985) 179

[21] I.Krichever, Comm.Pure Appl.Math. **47** (1994) 437; *The tau-function of the universal Whitham hierarchy, matrix models and topological field theories*, Preprint LPTENS-92-18; hep-th/9205110
I.Krichever, Comm.Math.Phys. **143** (1992) 415

[22] S.Kharchev and A.Marshakov, Int.J.Mod.Phys. **A10** (1995) 1219; hep-th/9303100

[23] A.Losev, Theor. and Math.Phys. **95** (1993) 307; hep-th/9211089
A.Losev and I.Polyubin, Int.J.Mod.Phys. **A10** (1995) 4161; hep-th/9305079

[24] M.Douglas, Phys.Lett. **B238** (1990) 176

[25] M.Fukuma, H.Kawai and R.Nakayama, Comm.Math.Phys. **148** (1992) 101

[26] A.Schwarz, Mod.Phys.Lett. **A6** (1991) 2713

[27] J.Harnad and A.Orlov, talk at the Goslar conference, 1996
A.Orlov, talk at the INTAS School "Advances in quantum firld theory and statistical mechanics", September 1996, and private communication

[28] J.Harvey and G.Moore, hepth/9510182

[29] R.Donagi and E.Markman, *Cubics, integrable systems and Calabi-Yau Threefolds*, preprint; *Spectral covers, algebraically completely integrable Hamiltonian systems and moduli of bundles*, preprint

[30] I.Krichever, Func.Anal. & Appl.**14** (1980) 282

[31] N.Seiberg and E.Witten, hepth/9609219

[32] A.Hanany and Y.Oz, hepth/9505075

[33] P.Argyres and A.Shapere, hepth/9509175
A.Hanany, hepth/9509176
A.Brandhuber and K.Landsteiner, hepth/9507008
U.H.Danielsson and B.Sundborg, hepth/9504102

[34] A.Marshakov, A.Mironov and A.Morozov, hepth/9701014

[35] N.Dorey, V.Khoze and M.Mattis, hepth/9607202; hepth/9611016
E.D'Hoker, I.Krichever and D.Phong, hepth/9609041